OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIFTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

---

5 GEORGE V., 1915

VOL. CXXI.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRTY-FIRST DAY OF MARCH TO THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF APRIL, INCLUSIVE.

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY J. DE L. TACHÉ, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1915

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—REVISED EDITION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Speaker: HON. THOMAS SIMPSON SPROULE.

Wednesday March 31, 1915.

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

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

THE METRIC SYSTEM.

*Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Is it a fact that the Imperial Government has rendered compulsory in Great Britain since January last the use of the metric system of weights and measures for pharmaceutical preparations?

2. If so, what is the text of the Order in Council putting in force said change?

3. Does the Canadian Government intend to follow the example of the Imperial Government?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. No. The use of the metric system is not compulsory in England, but simply legalized. Recently it has been adopted by the Druggists' Association as the most convenient.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The metric system has the same status in Canada as in England. It is legalized after standards adopted by La Convention Internationale du Metre. The metric standards are kept by the Department of Inland Revenue.

MAPLE SUGAR AND SYRUP.

Mr. KAY:

1. Has the Government taken any steps to enforce the provisions of the Adulteration Act establishing standards for maple sugar and maple syrup, passed in June, 1914?

2. If not, is it the intention of the Government to take immediate action against infringements of this Act?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. The Act passed in June, 1914, came into force only on the 1st January, 1915, and as important amendments were to be made at the present session, it was deemed advisable to wait a little longer before making investigation as to whether it was complied with or not.

2. An amendment to the Adulteration Act is at present before Parliament. When this is sanctioned, steps will at once be taken to ascertain whether the Act is being complied with or not, and proceedings taken against any party violating the law.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EMPLOYEES AT CHAUDIERE.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Is the Government aware that a regulation is reported to have been passed by the management of the Intercolonial railway, to take effect on the 5th March, instant, in virtue of which the employees on the Intercolonial, working at Chaudière, have lost time marked, and are not paid for such lost time, when they arrive after the hour fixed by such regulation, even though such delay is due to the sub-train which carries them from Lévis to Chaudière?

2. Is the Government aware that, in virtue of the same regulation, these same employees are obliged to receive their cheques at the supplies department and to cross several tracks on which locomotives are constantly moving?

3. Does the Government intend to continue the said regulation in force?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. The same regulations are in force at Chaudière Junction as at other engine houses on the system. Employees arriving late on account of the train being delayed are allowed to commence work at once, and paid accordingly; those arriving late through their own fault are not permitted to commence work until the next hour.

2. The time office is in the stores building. There are three tracks between the stores building and the round house which it is necessary for the men to cross. The movement over these tracks is not extensive and is slow, and necessary precautions are being taken to protect the men. This is only a temporary arrangement pending the installation of a time clock in the machine shop.

3. Yes.

TELEGRAPHERS' EMPLOYMENT.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Is the Government aware that on the 1st of January, 1915, the Great North Western Telegraph Company and the Canadian Northern Telegraph Company are said to have been amalgamated and that both lines are now operated under the name of Great North Western Telegraph Company?

2. Is the Government aware that, as alleged, George C. Corman and A. J. Worzel, both employees in the Montreal office of the Great North Western Telegraph Company, were given fifteen days' notice that after the 25th of March instant their services would no longer be required?

3. Is the Minister of Labour aware that these men hold first-class records and ample seniority, and that the action of the said company in this instance is contrary to the provisions of article 5 of the Award of the Board of Conciliation of 1911?

4. Does the Government, or the Department of Labour, intend to take any steps to have this rectified?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Statements on the subject of an apparently authentic character have been observed.

2. Communications received are to the general effect stated.

3. Communications received from the officers of the labour organization affected represent the situation generally to be as stated.

4. The matter has been taken up with the employing company concerned with a view to having what is possible done to have the differences which have arisen amicably arranged.

PRICE OF EXPORT HERRINGS.

Mr. MICHAUD:

Is it the intention of the Government to adopt a regulation under the provisions of the Fisheries Act regulating the price of small fresh herrings caught in Canadian waters and exported fresh to the Untied States?

Mr. HAZEN: No. The Fisheries Act does not give authority to make such a regulation.

RIGAUD WHARF.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Have tenders been called for the work being carried on at present on the Rigaud wharf?

2. If so, what are the names of the tenderers, and the amount of their tenders?

3. If not, who is in charge of such work?

4. What is the name or names of the superintendent or superintendents?

5. What amount did the Government appropriate for such work?

6. What is the scale of salaries paid to those who work on the said wharf?

7. Has it been recommended to the Government by its resident engineer and by others to purchase a piece of land adjacent to that belonging to the Government in order to lessen the incline of the road that is very steep between the wharf and the public highway?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No.

2. See answer to No. 1.

3. Paul Paradis, assistant engineer.

4. Hector Chevrier.

5. $2,500.

6. Superintendent, $3.50 per day; foreman-carpenter, $3.50 per day; carpenters, $3 per day; masons, $3 per day; labourers, $2 per day.

7. Yes.

THREE RIVERS PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. BUREAU:

1. Why was the work on the public buildings at Three Rivers suspended?

2. Did the Government make any arrangements since the signing of the contract with the contractors for the construction of the said buildings?

3. What is the amount mentioned in the contract for the construction of the wharf at Cap de la Madeleine?

4. How much money has been paid for that wharf since the commencement of construction to date, and to whom, and why were such moneys paid?

5. At whose request were the works on the Three Rivers wharves during the years 1914 and 1915 carried on?

6. Are such works paid for by the Government, or by the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers?

7. (a) At what date did the Government authorize such works, and (b) to whom did it confide the undertaking?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Weather was too cold to build stonework. No instructions were given to suspend, the contractors did so themselves, principally because they had no stone ready.

2. Arrangements were made to make the north and south elevations similar to the Notre Dame street elevation.

3. Schedule rates, approximately $56,000.

4. Total cost to 1912-1913, $9,167.56. In 1913-1914 the wharf was enlarged, under contract; paid to date, $57,426.62; total, $66,594.18.

5. Works done during 1914-15 were to complete work already under contract.

6. By the Government.

7. (a) May 18, 1910, March 18, 1912. (b) Collins & Giroux, of Ottawa.

SS. TYRIAN REPAIRS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Are any repairs now being made on the ss. Tyrian at Halifax?

2. If so, (a) who has the contract for the same, and (b) what is the amount to be expended?

3. Were tenders asked for said work? If so, who were asked to tender, and what were the amounts tendered, respectively?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Halifax Marine Engineering Co. has contract for repairs and renewals to machinery, $16,750, and for new boilers, $9,200; (b) T. Hogan & Co., Halifax, have contract for removal of old boilers, alterations to boiler room and installation of new boilers, $9,841.

3. Yes, tenders were called by public advertisement for new engines and boilers, and the following tenders were received:

Supply of New Engine.

1. Bow Mclachlin Co.	$10,416 00
2. McKie & Baxter	10,610 67
3. Polson Iron Works, Ltd.	12,244 00
4. The Jno. Inglis Co., Ltd.	12,500 00
5. The Halifax Engine Co., Ltd.*	14,300 00
6. Collingwood Shipbuilding Co, Ltd.	14,000 00
7. The Chaudière Machine and Foundry Co.	15,750 00

* Alternative offer to install compound surface condensing engine to be supplied by department and fit propeller to shaft, department to pay for ship hire and dockage, connect piping from boilers, pumps, circulating pump suction and discharge to sea, remove present engine and stow as directed for $13,600.

For repairs to old machinery.

1. The Halifax Marine Eng. Co., Ltd.	16,750 00
2. Burns & Kelleher	17,200 00

Supply of new boilers.

1. The Halifax Marine and Engine Co., Ltd.	9,200 00
2. International Engineering Works, Ltd.	9,500 00
3. The Jenckes Machine Co., Ltd.	9,554 00
4. Collingwood Shipbuilding Co., Ltd.	10,000 00
5. The Jno. Inglis Co., Ltd.	10,200 00
6. Polson Iron Works, Ltd.	10,936 00
7. The Chaudière Machine and Foundry Co.	18,500 00

Installation of new boilers.

1. The T. Hogan & Co.	9,841 00
2. Halifax Marine & Engineering Co.	14,550 00
3. A. A. Webber & Son	14,700 00

ARTHUR GILBERT.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has Mr. Arthur Gilbert been collector of excise or an employee of the Inland Revenue Department at Victoriaville?

2. When was he appointed to such position?

3. Did he succeed a Mr. J. U. Poirier and was the latter dismissed?

4. What salary did Mr. Gilbert receive during each of the years 1912, 1913 and 1914?

5. Had Mr. Gilbert an assistant at Victoriaville? If so, who was that assistant, and what was his salary?

6. What rent did the Government pay for Mr. Gilbert's office?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. Yes.

2. July 19, 1912.

3. Yes. Mr. J. U. Poirier.

4. 1912, $333.30; 1913, $799.92; 1914, $799.92.

5. No.

6. $20, monthly rent.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. A. W. Chisholm: For a copy of all applications received for Fenian raid bounty from residents of the county of Hants; also the names of persons who have been paid the bounty and those who have been refused it in said county; with the reasons for refusal, and showing the number of applications that have yet been dealt with.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): I desire to draw the attention of the House to a statement that appeared in the Toronto Globe of yesterday, which, to say the least of it, seems to me rather unfair. It reads as follows:

Early Prorogation to Hush Scandals?

Ottawa, March 29.—It looks as though the Government is now eager and determined to "close shop." It proposes, if possible, to crowd through remaining business and prorogue by the end of the present week. To do this it will be necessary to abandon the Easter adjournment and sit on Saturday. The Government notice providing for the Eastertide adjournment was formally put in, but since has been mysteriously withdrawn. Importance is attached to the new move to end Parliament as soon as possible by reason of the fact that prorogation would bring automatically a termination to the embarrassing investigations of the Public Accounts Committee, the special inquiry on soldier's boots and other investigations which threaten further serious disclosures.

The facts are that the Clerk of the House, following his usual practice, and without any special notification from any member of the Government, placed the usual notice on the Order Paper that when this House adjourns to-day it shall stand adjourned till next Tuesday. The first intimation I had of that notice being on the Order Paper was when hon. gentlemen opposite requested that it be withdrawn, and that we sit on Saturday, and on Monday and Tuesday of next week, in the hope of being able to conclude the business of the House within that time. Therefore I think it was rather unfair of the Globe to make the statement that

Importance is attached to the new move to end Parliament as soon as possible by reason of the fact that prorogation would bring automatically a termination to the embarrassing investigation of the Public Accounts Committee, the special inquiry on soldiers' boots and other investigations which threaten further serious disclosures.

I do not think that the Government, either in this House or in the Public Accounts Committee, have given any evidence of a desire to prevent any matter from coming out that hon. gentlemen desired to be brought to the attention of the House and the country. I claim that the statement of the Globe is a very unfair representation of the facts, by reason of the fact that if the motion mentioned has been withdrawn it has been withdrawn at the request of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have only to say that if this motion was withdrawn at the request of gentlemen on this side of the House, I have no knowledge of it. The attitude of the Opposition this session has been to facilitate business as much as they possibly could; I think everybody will agree that we have had no other desire. For my part, I at one time indulged in the hope that it would be possible to close by Easter, and some time ago, when the Government proposed to take Mondays, I asked what business they had still to bring down. We were told what business they had to bring down, but since that day the Government has been continually bringing down new business of which we had no notice. To-day there is a new Bill on the Order Paper, to amend the Supreme Court Act. We were given no notice of that. The Estimates were brought down only last evening. If, under such circumstances, we are to sit from day to day I have no objection, but I think it would be preferable to have the usual Easter adjournment. If the Government desires otherwise, we on this side of the House are ready to go on.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I gave notice of my motion to the Clerk, and it appears in the Votes and Proceedings this morning. It is in accordance with what I stated two or three days ago, that we should ask the House to adjourn Thursday night and sit again on Saturday and on Monday in order to speed business through as quickly as possible. The Opposition have a perfect right to sufficient time in which to consider all measures that are brought down. Some new measures have been brought down which were rather unexpected, but I am told they are not very serious, and I hope they will not take a very long time to discuss and dispose of. I am quite sure that the opinion which prevails on both sides of the House is that with the exception of Good Friday, we should stick to business until the business of the House is finished.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask if there are any more measures to be brought down by the Government, or is this the last?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There are no more measures to be brought down that I know of.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: "I know of" is rather elastic.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But of course one never knows what may happen.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am afraid that is true.

Mr. DOHERTY: The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has mentioned the Bill to amend the Supreme Court Act. Unless my memory is entirely at fault, when the right hon. gentleman asked the question as to what business might be expected, the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Robert Borden), on my reminding him of it, mentioned that there might possibly be a Bill to amend the Supreme Court Act. It is a very trifling amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think my hon. friend is right in that. But that was ten days ago, and the Bill now appears for the first time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS REPRESENTATION ACT AMENDMENT.

CORRECTION OF CLERICAL ERRORS.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), the House went into Committee on Bill No. 106, to amend the Representation Act, 1914—Sir Robert Borden; Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1—Nipissing:

Mr. DOHERTY: As was explained when this Bill was introduced, its purpose is simply to correct certain errors in the description of some of the constituencies as set forth in the Act of last year providing for the redistribution. As I understand it, there are no substantial changes in any constituency. It is merely the correction of errors in description, and if I am correctly informed, the matter has been looked into by the committee that dealt

with redistribution, and the Bill as it now stands represents correctly what was agreed upon as being necessary.

Mr. BUREAU: What are the constituencies affected by these corrections ?

Mr. DOHERTY: Nipissing, London, Quebec West, Jacques Cartier, Wright, Labelle and Hull, Portage la Prairie, Springfield, and some constituencies in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. PARDEE: This was necessary because, as I understand it, one side of the boundary of the city of London had been entirely left out and this describes it.

Mr. DOHERTY: The effect of the description was to include in London sections which it was not intended to include.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In regard to Nipissing, the first amendment simply strikes out the word "Kelly." Kelly should not be there?

Mr. DOHERTY: Kelly should not be there. I understand that Kelly is a township some seven townships to the south of the boundary. It was put in there by error.

On paragraph 4—Quebec West:

Mr. LACHANCE: Some explanation is necessary here. Perhaps the minister has an explanation to give.

Mr. DOHERTY: In the Act that was passed Limoilou was included in Quebec East. Limoilou includes the village of Stadacona, which was intended to be in Quebec West. For the purpose of taking Stadacona from Quebec East I beg to move:

That paragraph 4 be amended by inserting after the figure 6 the words: "(b) The description of the electoral district of Quebec East is amended by adding at the end thereof the following words: 'Exclusive of the village of Stadacona'; and further that clause (c) of the same paragraph 4 be amended by inserting in the third line, after the words 'St. Malo' the words, 'and the village of Stadacona.'"

This will have the effect of placing the village of Stadacona where it was intended to be placed, that is, in Quebec West.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: For the sake of clearness I would suggest that the section be redrafted as it should read, instead of amending it in this way.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think that would be better. There is a change to be made in regard to Hull and Labelle, and it might be understood that these sections will be taken as passed, they to be redrafted and the changes incorporated in them.

On section 5—Jacques Cartier shall not include any portion of St. Denis ward:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This amendment is not clear.

Mr. DOHERTY: St. Denis ward was in Jacques Cartier as it existed at the time of the passing of the Act, and it should have been included in the places that were excluded from Jacques Cartier. It was not mentioned as being excluded, though it is mentioned as forming part of a new electoral district.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is it in Maisonneuve?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is described as the electoral district of St. Denis, and the Act says that that electoral district shall be composed of the whole of St. Denis ward. As the Act stands, St. Denis ward is apparently in this new riding, and also in Jacques Cartier.

Section agreed to.

Mr. PARDEE: As I understand it, the amendment with regard to Hull and Labelle is in conformity with the arrangement made yesterday by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) with Mr. Gisborne, the law clerk.

Mr. DOHERTY: There has been no change that I know of.

Mr. PARDEE: The minister has before him the written amendment with regard to Labelle and Wright.

Mr. DOHERTY: This is sent to me as being the result of the conference.

Mr. PARDEE: Quite so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is there any change in section 6 with regard to Buckingham?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. In the description of the electoral district of Hull, the townships of Southeast Buckingham and North Templeton, not being named, were left in the electoral districts of Labelle and Wright respectively. It was intended that both those townships should be in Hull. That was the reason of the introduction of subsection 6 into this Bill. I understand that, as a result of the conference of yesterday, there was to be added to subsection 6 these words:

And the municipality of South Hull shall form part of the electoral district of Hull and not part of the electoral district of Wright.

Mr. ROGERS: That is changing the boundaries altogether. It is going too far.

Mr. DOHERTY: That amendment was handed to me as a result of a conference of yesterday. I am not myself sufficiently familiar with the geography of the district to know exactly what the change means.

Mr. ROGERS: If we adopt that amendment, we adopt the principle that we decided not to take into consideration at all, that is, the changing of the boundaries. I understood this Bill was simply to correct errors made in the descriptions of the electoral districts. This opens up a wider field altogether.

12 noon.

Mr. PARDEE: I understood from the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Achim) that a piece had been taken out of the city of Hull which should have been left in. South Hull was really transferred to another riding, although that was not the intention of the original Act at all.

Mr. ROGERS: It may be all right, but I think we had better allow the section to stand.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will have it recast.

Subsection 6 stands.

On subsection 8—Portage la Prairie:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the change here?

Mr. ROGERS: Under the Act as it now stands, the portions mentioned are included both in Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie. They will now be Winnipeg alone.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 9—Springfield:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In what electoral district will the portions named be included?

Mr. ROGERS: According to the Act as it now stands, they are included in both Winnipeg and Springfield. They will now be in Winnipeg alone.

Subsection agreed to.

Progress reported.

ADULTERATION ACT AMENDMENT.

MAPLE SUGAR AND SYRUP.

On motion of Hon. P. E. Blondin (Minister of Inland Revenue) Bill No. 114, to amend the Adulteration Act was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1—imitation or compound maple sugar or maple syrup to be labelled:

Mr. ROBB: Last session a deputation of the maple sugar makers of Canada was introduced to the Minister of Inland Revenue, and upon their recommendation a Bill on this subject was passed by Parliament. Will the minister please explain why it is that he comes before Parliament to-day asking for an amendment of that Act of last session? Upon whose demand is this new legislation introduced?

Mr. BLONDIN: As I stated on a previous occasion, it was found that the Act of last session was not workable. This Bill proposes to amend that Act so as to authorize the maker or seller of the imitation article to label the article so as to make the public aware that it is an imitation. I will give the details of these amendments.

Section 29 (a) as appears in section 4 of chapter 19 of the Revised Statutes, 1914, entitled "An Act To Amend the Adulteration Act," is repealed. This repealed section provided that no article of food should be sold as maple sugar or maple syrup unless it was pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup, and that every article which did not comply with the standard for maple sugar and maple syrup as provided by statute should be deemed to be adulterated,—that is to say, in case the article represented to be maple sugar or maple syrup was offered for sale and did not comply with the standard, then the vendor would have to prove that it was really pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup.

The second subsection of that section provided that the word "maple" should not be used on a label of any article or on a package containing it unless the article was pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup, but, by a clerical error, the words "which is or" were inserted at the end of the fourth line of said subsection and had the effect of prohibiting the use of the word "maple" on the label of even pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup, thereby, in a certain sense, defeating the object of the Act.

The amendments provided in subsection 1 are, in effect: that any article of food which has the appearance of maple sugar or which is partly composed of maple sugar and maple syrup must bear a label containing the words "imitation maple

sugar" or "imitation maple syrup" or "compound maple sugar" or "compound maple syrup," so that the purchaser of such an article shall receive due notice that what he is buying is in fact a "compound" or an "imitation" of maple sugar or maple syrup and thereby will not be deceived as to what he is purchasing.

Subsection 2 is to the same effect as the latter part of subsection 1 of section 29 (a) of last year's amendment, that is to say, it throws the obligation on the vendor of maple sugar or maple syrup, who does not comply with the standard of proving that the article is really maple sugar or maple syrup.

Subsection 3 is the same as subsection 2 of section 29 (a) of last year's amendment, with the exception that the words "which is or" are struck out.

Section 2 of the Bill amends sections 31 and 32 of the Adulteration of Foods Act. Section 31 is amended by adding the words " and not less than $25 and costs," in subsection (b) after the word " costs " in the third line thereof. In the Act as it stands at present, there is no minimum fine, and it is deemed advisable that a fine of $25 as a minimum should be imposed in cases of violation of the Adulteration Act, covered by this section.

Section 32 is amended for the same reason, the words " and not less than $50 and costs," are added after the word " both " in the fourth line of subsection (a), so that a minimum fine should be imposed in cases of violation of the Act provided for by this subsection.

The words, " and not less than $25 and costs, and for each subsequent offence a penalty not exceeding $200 and costs, or six months in jail, or both and not less than $50 and costs," are added to subsection (b) after the word " then " in the fourth line of said subsection (b). These two sections of the Act (31 and 32) are deemed incomplete as they are at present, and it was thought advisable to amend them in the manner suggested.

Section 37 of the Act is also repealed, and the amendment as suggested in section 3 of the proposed Bill is substituted therefor. The intention of this amendment is to reach the vendor of an article resembling maple syrup, who does not label this article as being an " imitation " or a " compound," and also provides for a higher minimum penalty, also for a penalty for subsequent offences, which section 37 as it is at present, does not provide for.

Subsection 40 of the Act is repealed, and replaced by the section appearing in section 4 of the present Bill. The intention of this amendment is to give the person who gives information or otherwise helps in the detection or violation of the Adulteration Act, one half the penalty. It is expected that this amendment will be a great help to the department in the application of the law and the detection of all violations thereof.

I understand that the most contentious question in regard to this Bill is whether the law should entirely prohibit the sale of compounds of maple syrup or maple sugar, or whether this trade should be allowed to go on provided the public are made aware that they are buying a compound or imitation article, and are not buying pure maple syrup or pure maple sugar. The reason in favour of allowing this trade to go on is that many people cannot afford to buy the pure article, but would like to buy the compound, which is cheaper. I am inclined to believe that there would be no objection to such sale so long as the public are made aware that they are buying the imitation; and I think that is one of the worst evils from which the maple sugar industry is suffering—that to-day the adulterated stuff can be sold on the market without my department being able to interfere to prevent it, even though the purchaser may be under the impression that it is pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup that he is purchasing. Under the present Act dealers may sell adulterated sugar or syrup provided they put no label on the package. The aim of the Act is to force the man who manufactures a compound or makes any adulteration of the sugar or syrup to announce it to the public and put on his package the word " imitation." So long as the maple sugar is pure the dealer is not obliged to use any label. Articles which have no labels on are supposed to be pure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The objection to this legislation, which comes so soon after the Act of last session, is that to some extent it favours adulteration. Adulteration is one of the evils of this modern age. Scarcely anything that comes upon the table is not in some way adulterated by some industrious man who derives a profit from doing so at the expense of the consumer. The manufacturers of maple sugar last year interviewed the Government protesting against the adulteration of maple sugar, and had it made an offence. I think every-

body will agree that we should prevent, as far as we can, adulteration of any kind of food. This year those who have been adulterating maple sugar come back and ask permission still to sell adulterated sugar providing that they announce it to the public in a certain way, but they should not be allowed to adulterate it. Adulteration ought not to be encouraged, and the answer that should have been given those who came and asked the privilege of putting adulterated sugar on the market should have been: You must conform to the law, and the law passed last year requires that all maple sugar shall be pure. That should have been the answer instead of saying that they must announce that the sugar is adulterated. I think the objection taken by the hon. gentleman for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) is very serious, and ought to be taken into consideration by the Government, that the Bill which my hon. friend is now amending was introduced last year at the request of the maple sugar makers. They protested against their product being adulterated in any way, and I am surprised that, twelve months after passing that law, those against whom the law was directed are able to come back again and obtain the privilege of doing what was denied them last year.

Mr. BLONDIN: Although this Bill may appear to give more protection to the adulterators, it is, on the contrary, an effort to devise some means to follow them. What has happened under the law of last year? We have had more adulteration of maple sugar than we had before. Why? Because the dealers put on the market maple syrup with all kinds of labels which we cannot control, which did not contain the word "maple," while in many cases they informed their customers verbally that it was maple syrup they were selling.

Mr. BUREAU: How is the labelling of the packages going to help? Supposing a man sells an adulterated package and does not label it, he is liable to a fine. You must first have an inspector analyse the contents of the package to ascertain that it is not pure maple syrup. Under the old Act the man selling such adulterated goods would be subject to a fine. This is only recognizing the compound of maple syrup and helping the man who wishes to cheat the public to put on the market an article not fit for consumption. If you want to prevent that and to prevent compounds going on the market, you ought to make the man who offers the adulterated article subject to a penalty. You have no more guarantee that the man who is going to adulterate maple syrup will put his label on it than that the man who is offering maple syrup will say: This is not the right stuff I am selling you; I have put yellow sugar in it. The minister knows that the man who resorts to that means will not spend money to put labels on his goods telling the public what he is doing.

Mr. BLONDIN: To-day it is left to my department to detect the adulterators; but by this Act we are compelling the adulterators to self-denunciation; every article that is put on the market must be labelled "imitation" if it is not pure.

Mr. BUREAU: Why legalize adulteration by putting that label on the package?

Mr. BLONDIN: We do not.

Mr. BUREAU: You do. I may go on the market with an adulterated package, but the moment I put on the package the words "compound maple syrup," I am within the law.

Mr. BLONDIN: It is more a question of whether our efforts to prevent adulteration is to prevent only for the sake of prevention or to make the public aware that they are buying adulterated goods. If I want to buy this imitation I have the choice of doing so. I do not think that we should prevent a man who wants to buy these imitations from doing so; but I think we must force the dealer to make the public aware that such and such products are compounds.

Mr. ROBB: The position that the minister has just taken is a complete change from the attitude of his predecessor last year, when the farmers and makers of maple syrup were before the Committee on Agriculture, and from the position taken by the Minister of Agriculture who was present at that gathering. Members of the Agricultural Committee may remember that quite a large deputation of maple sugar makers from the province of Quebec and eastern Ontario waited on the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Agriculture and objected to this very practice. They strongly resented the use of the word "maple" in connection with these adulterations that are made up in cellars in Montreal and sent out to the people in the Northwest and British Columbia, branded as maple sugar, or adulterated sugar,

if you will. Their point was that the imitators should not be allowed to use the word " maple " at all, and with that view the minister's predecessor and the Minister of Agriculture sided and took very strong ground before the committee. I think the minister should give some better explanation of this change of policy.

Mr. BLONDIN: My hon. friend knows that there are articles on the market which are really not maple syrup, and on which the word " maple " does not appear.

Mr. ROBB: They would not bring the price they would fetch if the word " maple " were on them. It is the word " maple " that gives them value.

Mr. BLONDIN: First of all, if you want to use the word " maple " you have to put it in a conspicuous position. The section says:

> No person shall keep for sale, offer or expose for sale, or sell, any article of food resembling or being an imitation of maple sugar or maple syrup, or which is composed partly of maple sugar or maple syrup and which is not pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup, unless the article itself or the package containing it is labelled with the words " imitation maple sugar " or " imitation maple syrup," or " compound maple sugar " or " compound maple syrup," as the case may be, in a conspicuous place on the article itself.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If my hon. friend reads the whole section he will see that the word " imitation " need not be on it at all. A man might sell a compound, having on one side the words " compound maple syrup " and on the other side " extra pure article," and that would give the impression of being the very best kind of maple syrup. The word " imitation " need not be on it at all under this section.

Mr. TURRIFF: What is the object in allowing adulterated maple sugar and maple syrup to be put on the market at all? We in the West do not produce any maple sugar or maple syrup, but we buy a good deal; and many times we have bought what purported to be maple syrup or maple sugar, but what turned out to be an imitation made of yellow muscovado sugar. Why should manufacturers be permitted to do that? Why does not the minister settle the whole matter by imposing a heavy penalty on any one who sells in any shape or form adulterated maple sugar or maple syrup that purports to be the real article? He should allow the sale of pure maple sugar and maple syrup and nothing else. By this Bill the minister is allowing anybody to sell adulterated maple sugar or maple syrup. This will only make matters much worse. Why does not the minister continue the policy of his predecessor a little further and impose such penalties on the man who is found selling adulterated maple sugar or maple syrup that he will never do it again? That would overcome the whole difficulty.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know that I am very well versed in this question, but I should like to know the object that is sought to be attained by insisting that there should be no possible method by which a man might make a compound of maple syrup. Whether or not it is desirable to allow such compounds to be sold I am not prepared to say. But when the word " adulterated " is used, it always gives the idea that the article is being set up for something that it is not. What is not quite clear to my mind is this: Why should we prevent a perfectly honest man from making a syrup of which maple may form one of the component parts, a syrup which is cheaper than the pure maple syrup, and which some persons are desirous of buying? I should like to know what harm is going to be done by allowing that man to put his ware upon the market with the statement staring everybody in the face that it is what it is, that it is not maple syrup, but an imitation. Perhaps some better word than compound could be found. I understand that the purpose of this legislation is to make any man who wants to sell such an article as I have described tell the public that it is what it is, and that it is not maple syrup. If it be an evil to allow people to make a compound of maple syrup, then this course may not be a desirable thing; but if the evil consists simply in a man's selling as maple syrup what really is not maple syrup, it seems to me this Bill will aid in counteracting the evil, and it will not produce a result whereby you would prohibit a man perfectly honest from making an article of which maple syrup might form a component part, and which is cheaper than the pure article.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not know whether the minister has received any correspondence on the subject, but I have from parties who strongly object to the Bill. Their objection to it is this. Maple sugar and maple syrup are peculiarly Canadian products, and the makers of these articles are anxious to have maple sugar and maple syrup known on the mar-

ket; but for years past they have had to suffer from the malignant industry of some people who adulterate these articles. As I stated a moment ago, the adulteration of food is one of the evils of the present day. It is to be found not only in maple sugar and maple syrup, but in almost everything. Now, the object of the law and the object of the Government ought to be to prevent adulteration, and to see that no food comes on the table unless it is what it purports to be. There are parties who make some compound of maple sugar and of maple syrup, but that is not in the interest of public health. It is injurious to health, and certainly injurious to the genuine article. This question came before the House last year, and it has several times been before the House and the country. A delegation of the makers of maple sugar came before the Committee of Agriculture last year, and as a result of their representations and the deliberation of the Government upon them the present Adulteration Act was passed. But steps are now to be taken to make that law ineffective. That is the objection which the makers of maple sugar and maple syrup have to this Bill, and it is an objection worthy of consideration by this Government. The makers have given this matter their very best thought, and decided that there should be no adulteration at all of the articles they produce. That is the sum total of their objection. They object to this legislation because it allows an adulteration which is altogether objectionable.

Mr. MARCIL: As a constant user of maple sugar and maple syrup I must give my own experience. It is the most difficult thing in the world to obtain the genuine article to-day. If you go into any high-class grocery store in Montreal or any other city you have to accept the salesman's word that what you are getting is genuine maple sugar or maple syrup. It has been only within the last ten or fifteen years that the maple groves have been getting scarce in the province of Quebec. I am not so familiar with Ontario, so I will not speak about that. When they began to disappear, it was felt that there was a need for a substitute, and a way was found of getting up an artistic imitation on which the word "compound" was hidden away somewhere, and the word "maple" put in a conspicuous place. It is most difficult to obtain the genuine article to-day.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

The Minister of Justice, who comes from the province of Quebec, knows the high value that is placed upon the industry. It is essentially a national industry, and is unique in this respect. Therefore it should be safeguarded in every possible way. No adulteration of any kind should be permitted.

Mr. MORRIS: This is a question which interests me to a very considerable extent. I think the legislation which was passed last year was very acceptable to the sugar makers of the district from which I come. I do not think that the sugar makers of our district would have any objection to any company manufacturing any syrups they desired to produce; but, as one coming from a district which is very much interested in the manufacture of sugar, I very much object to any company borrowing the name "maple." Maple sugar is one of the best and most wholesome products of our country. The industry is a very important one, and I feel it is the duty of this Government to protect it. The object of the farmers who came here last year was simply to protect that industry. They did not want to borrow anything from any other industry; they simply wanted to protect an honest industry, and I think it is the duty of this Government to do right by these people.

Mr. G. BOYER (Vaudreuil) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I congratulate sincerely the Minister of Inland Revenue for introducing to-day this legislation which has been for a long time expected and the need of which has been felt also for a long time. His predecessor, at the last session, introduced a Bill, on which, if I am not mistaken, this one is an improvement. I take this opportunity also of expressing my thanks to the minister and his officers who have made it easy for me to secure interviews for the purpose of discussing the Bill.

It is not therefore, Mr. Chairman, believe me, with a critical disposition, that I rise now, but only to ask that it be finally retouched so as to be made for the present entirely effective and satisfactory both to those to whom it applies, many of whom are electors of mine, and to myself.

The maple sugar industry, must be placed on the same footing as all the other agricultural industries, and really it is due to the general ignorance of its great possibilities if it has been heretofore neglected. Up to the present time the farmer has manufactured maple syrup and sugar solely for his fam-

ily's use; it was only as a luxury that the consumer bought yearly a certain quantity for his table. Lately it has been discovered that this industry, heretofore unexploited, could be turned into a gold mine for the farmers; and that, in order to extract this gold which would go to swell the income of the farm, this industry must be given a wider scope and a new direction. The awakening has been general. Here, the late Government distributed to 50,000 owners of maple-bushes a very valuable pamphlet on the manufacture of maple syrup and sugar, and drafted a Bill designed to give protection to the producer. At Quebec, at the same time, the provincial government opened in different parts of the province schools for the practical teaching of this industry. In a word the movement is spreading all over and gives good promises for the future. A society, comprising some of the most notable producers, and persons interested in this industry, and of which I am president, although not myself a producer, was formed two years ago, and apparently has taken upon itself the important as well as patriotic task of acting as intermediary between the mass of the producers and those authorities who see to the making of laws, the protection of rights, the opening of markets, etc. I have always myself taken a deep concern in this industry, although the number of producers to be found in my county is not at all commensurate with its extent. That was my reason, as early as 1906, for rising in this House to speak in favour of this industry. On that occasion I was spokesman for a powerful association of farmers of Vaudreuil.

At that time, already distant, I was given encouragement. And I am glad to say that greater care has since been given to the inspection of adulterated products, but adulterators can never be proceeded against too rigorously. It is only of late that the Government seems to have resolved seriously to enact a law for the protection of that new agricultural industry, and I shall not be sparing in my congratulations.

First of all, before taking up the Bill, we may ask if this industry deserves to be noticed by this House. Is the maple industry, meaning thereby the extraction of the sap to be manufactured into sugar or syrup, profitable to the producers and consequently for the country in general? After a close study of the question, and after comparing it with the other money-crops on the farm, I find that many of these are on the whole less productive than the sugar industry. I am satisfied that it will come as a surprise to many to learn that the sugar industry, until now considered insignificant as a source of income, does, on the contrary, bring to the farmer quite a profit. If we may rely on the last census, the annual production of maple sugar exceeds that of the fruit-growing industry. Our orchards and fruit trees of various species have yielded approximately, in 1911, $1,470,000, that is 14 per cent less than the maple-tree. The value of maple sugar and syrup manufactured in 1911 exceeds the value of sheep sold and killed on the farm in 1910; is almost equal to the value of poultry sold and killed in the same year; amounts to more than the quantity of cream sold and is six times greater than the value of the total yield of honey and wax. Take my own county; according to statistics I myself gathered last year, 128 farmers have together notched 96,465 maple trees, from which 13,740 gallons of syrup and 18,811 pounds of sugar were manufactured, representing a total value of $19,712. The number of producers in the county exceeded 128, but only that number have answered the circular I sent around.

The annual product of the maple-tree reaches about $2,000,000 and if there was provided proper protection, it would in a very few years amount to $6,000,000, the increase going into the pockets of the farmers and those who engage in the sugar industry. If then the Government would give the same care to the development of that industry which it gives to the other farm specialties, enough sugar and syrup could be produced to supply the whole Canadian market. Our sugar and syrup could take the place of all other known sugars and syrups. Now, what is required to rebuild or, if you prefer, to build up, this industry, are the combined efforts of all who are directly or indirectly interested in the development of agriculture. We know from past experience that by a well distributed propaganda, we have almost created the dairy industry and stock-raising. Many other astonishing results have been obtained from a systematic propaganda organized by the various governments, from the laws of these governments and from the combined efforts of the farmers and educated and patriotic persons. The maple industry, during this last decade, instead of expanding, has been steadily declining till it could almost be said to be on the eve of disappearing, when competent and devoted men suddenly decided to come to its rescue

and present circumstances seem of a nature to encourage them.

I shall now give figures showing the progress of this industry since 1850, which point to the conclusion that a considerable amount of money has been lost to our farmers, because they neglected to work the maple-tree. I have drawn important information from the annual report of the co-operative society of maple sugar and syrup producers. This information is furnished by Mr. Joseph H. Lefèvre, secretary of the society, John H. Grimm, a Montreal manufacturer and other distinguished men who take an interest in this industry. In looking into these statistics it will be found that the maple region extends throughout Quebec, Ontario, and the maritime provinces, and that about two-thirds of the total production is in Quebec. Canada produced from

1850 to 1860, 135,000,000 of pounds of maple sugar.

1860 to 1870, 175,000,000 of pounds of maple sugar, an increase of 40,000,000.

1870 to 1880, 190,000,000 of pounds of maple sugar, an increase of 15,000,000.

1880 to 1890, 225,000,000 of pounds of maple sugar, an increase of 35,000,000.

1890 to 1900, 212,000,000 of pounds of maple sugar, a decrease of 13,000,000.

1900 to 1910, 196,000,000 of pounds of maple sugar, a decrease of 16,000,000.

Those figures are to be apportioned among the different provinces in about the following proportion: Quebec contributed 65 per cent of the total output of maple sugar and syrup manufactured in Canada; Ontario, 32 per cent, and the maritime provinces, 3 per cent.

But how explain the decrease of 16,000,000 of pounds in the production of maple sugar during the ten years from 1890 to 1900? That decrease is due to the adulterators of all kinds, who, by their unfair competition, have disheartened the farmers On June 6, 1905, out of one hundred samples of syrup tested by the Inland Revenue officers, 76 were found to have been adulterated; which means that one-quarter was pure and three-quarters mixtures. In the second series of tests made, 34 per cent of the samples proved adulterated. On February 16, 1911, Mr. McGill wrote to Mr. Grimm, of Montreal, that out of twelve hundred sample tests only 59 came up to the standard which had been adopted as the legal standard. On the other hand, the sugar-bush has been neglected in certain localities. The small state of Vermont, with an area of only 10,200 square miles, has an annual production of sugar amounting to $1,086,933. This figure is an eloquent answer to those who would say that there is no money in the maple syrup and sugar industry. According to the census of the United States of 1910, which gives the data for 1909, maple sugar is made in nineteen states. The total number of trees notched, 18,899,533; pounds of sugar made, 14,060,206; gallons of syrup made, 4,106,611, corresponding to 43,119,416 pounds of sugar. Out of this total output, Vermont, the smallest of the seventeen states supplied 7,726,817 pounds, that being 700,000 pounds more than all the other states put together.

Apart from its interest as a source of supply of sugar and syrup the maple industry is of importance in connection with the preservation of our maple forests. To-day the economic importance of reforestation is a frequent topic of discussion. Mr. R. H. Campbell, superintendent of forests for the Dominion Government, has expressed the opinion that it would be more profitable to plant maple trees that reach a diameter of eighteen inches in 120 years than yellow pine-trees that would take only 60 years to reach the same size. The value of the maple-tree is not in its sap alone. It is much valued as a hard wood and very useful. Maple wood is used in the manufacture of agricultural implements, for the making of various parts of carriages, for the wood-work of buildings, as flooring, for the keels of sea-going vessels, for shoe-makers' pegs, saddle stocks, etc. Bird's-eye maple is much sought after for the veneering of expensive furniture and the inside finish of railway passenger coaches. Lastly, maple makes excellent fuel, and is used in the preparation of charcoal, wood alcohol and acetic acid. So the maple-tree, besides an ornamental tree of great beauty, is a source of annual revenue to the farmer and to the lumberman when it is no longer useful for sugar-making or when the farmer having an excess of it may dispose of a certain quantity. The planting of maple-trees is then worth while going into. Suppose that every one of the 55,000 sugar-makers grow only ten acres, that would mean 550,000 acres, or about 1,000 square miles of land. Of all the industries, none is so typical of Canada and none yields a larger profit for the money invested and for the care which is given to it, and that without exhausting the soil. Yet, it must be admitted that 75 per cent of Canadian territory is unfit for the cultivation of cereals on account of the large number of stones to be found in it, and that if those

lands were left to themselves, they would be unproductive and perhaps abandoned. Now, out of those 55,000 sugar-makers, I am informed that a bare thousand are able to manufacture a first-class product; that is due to the lack of modern methods, with which they have not yet been made sufficiently acquainted.

Mr. Speaker, I have given a brief outline only of the possibilities of our national industry. National it is indeed, because it is carried on almost exclusively in our own country, and the north-eastern American states. All countries in the world grow cereals and raise domestic cattle for consumption, but Canada has a monopoly of the manufacture of maple syrup and sugar. And if the Dominion Government and the provincial legislatures concerned take the least care to promote that industry, the Dominion Government, by practical and even radical enactments, and the local governments by the diffusion of theoretical knowledge, wonderful results may be expected in the near future.

The Bill now before the House is opportune and again I congratulate the minister. The new proposals are for the present embodied in a general Act, but let us look forward to a not far distant time when the sugar industry will have in the statute-books its own special and more elaborate legislation. I am afraid, however, that section 29 of this Bill is not framed to provide for producers and consumers the protection that it is expected to give against adulteration. As it now reads, subsection 1 of section 29 stipulates this:

Section 29A of the Act respecting Adulterations, being chapter 133 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as enacted by chapter 19 of the statutes of 1914, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

29A. No person will keep for sale, offer or expose for sale, or sell any article of food resembling or being an imitation of maple sugar or maple syrup, or which is composed partly of maple sugar or maple syrup and which is not pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup unless the said article or the package containing the said article is labelled with the words "imitation of maple sugar" or "imitation of maple syrup" or "compound maple sugar" or "compound maple syrup," as the case may be, in a conspicuous place upon the said article or upon the said package and in large letters easily seen, of a different colour from the label or other letters which appear on the label; the said letters to be at least one-quarter of an inch in height, printed on the same line and entirely separate from all other inscription on the label.

That subsection, it is true, takes away from adulterators the privilege enjoyed by them to this day of selling as pure a product which was not pure in the least. It obliges them, it is true, to label their goods, and declare that their product is not pure. But the Bill does not go so far as to provide that they will have to state to what extent the sugar or syrup offered for sale is not pure; and they will still enjoy a dangerous measure of impunity. Elsewhere, however, the Bill requires of the actual producers of the pure article that their products will come up to the standard fixed by the regulations of the Department of Inland Revenue. If a standard has been set for sugar and syrup that will be sold as pure and labelled as such, how shall it be known to what extent the articles labelled "imitation of maple syrup" or "compound maple sugar" are offensive or inoffensive. Those who prepare the adulterated article will not be to blame, except in extreme cases, because they will be authorized by law to sell the adulterated product, provided they put on the required label. That is a door open to adulterators, who are not even now overscrupulous. The last part of subsection 1 of section 29 puts a serious handicap on the unfortunate producer of the pure article and endangers the whole industry. If the Bill were to be adopted as it now reads, it is my opinion and that of competent persons with whom I discussed the matter at length, that it would destroy all that has been done for that industry heretofore, and the total output would continue to decline, as I have shown it to have done by quoting statistics since 1850.

Now, why allow adulterators to set up such a competition so hurtful to honest producers. Such a competition is to a certainty bound to bring about the collapse of the maple sugar and syrup industry. Why also should we make it easy for consumers to buy a syrup made up of 99 per cent ordinary sugar and 1 per cent maple product and be deceived into the belief that he is buying a maple product in whole or in part.

It may be asked how the competition of the adulterated article may be so disastrous to the producers. The question is as easily answered as put. A farmer, for instance, sells his pure maple syrup, say $1 a gallon. Now if a merchant buys a gallon and makes five or ten gallons out of it, which he then retails at the same price as the farmer; is not such a competition ruinous for the farmer? And, on the other hand, is it not an out-and-out theft from

the consumer who pays for an imitation of syrup or sugar or for a compound the same price he would pay for the pure article?

Looking at it from another viewpoint, the diffusion of the adulterated articles on the market prevents honest producers from obtaining a fair price for their goods.

The Quebec government, out of the Dominion grant, is helping technical education and will open three practical schools for demonstrating the modern methods of manufacturing maple sugar and maple syrup. A society, with a membership of many hundreds of producers, has been organized in the province of Quebec, and others will soon be formed, to secure better protection for the maple industry and to promote it among our farmers.

I am not opposed to people making a practice of mixing with our maple syrup or sugar other uninjurious substances to make a compound article; it is their right, as it is also the consumer's own business if he cares to buy an adulterated or compound article. But then let those impure products be sold under some designation; let them be labelled "the syrup of Mr. So and So," or distinguished by any other name which may be suitable and appropriate; but let it be declared illegal and liable to severe penalties to couple with these other names the word "maple".

I therefore suggest to the minister and I do move, with his leave, that the following words be omitted from subsection 1 of section 29:

—unless the said article or the package containing the said article is labelled with the words "imitation of maple sugar" or "imitation maple syrup" or "compound maple sugar" or "compound maple syrup," as the case may be, in a conspicuous place upon the said article or upon the said package and in large letters easily seen of a different colour from the label or other letters which appear on the label; the said letters to be at least one-quarter of an inch in height, printed on the same line and entirely separate from all other inscription on the label.

And then I will, on behalf of the Co-operative Society of Producers of Maple Syrup and Sugar, give my assent to the Bill.

At one o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. BLONDIN: Before recess we had an interesting discussion about the Bill. I have prepared amendments which, I hope, will meet the wishes of all parties. The effect of these amendments will be to leave the law as it was before, not permitting any compound or adulterated maple products to be put on the market. The Bill, then, will only make slight changes in the wording of the law so as to make it enforceable. Section 1 of the Bill amends section 29 of the present law. In the proposed amendment of subsection 1, I would strike out all the words except those prohibiting the manufacture, keeping, offering for sale, or the sale of imitation or compound maple sugar or maple syrup. Subsection 2 defining adulterated maple sugar or maple syrup will stand. In subsection 3, restricting the use of the word "maple" to pure maple sugar or syrup, the words "except as herein otherwise provided" will be dropped. Subsection 3 amends the existing law, in which the words "which is or," in combination with the rest of the subsection, have the effect of prohibiting the use of the word "maple," even on the pure maple sugar or syrup itself.

Mr. DEMERS (Translation.): Mr. Chairman, in order to carry out the purpose of this Bill which is to make sure that the consumer will get an absolutely pure article, subsection 3 of section 29a should also be amended by omitting in lines 6 and 7, page 2 of the Bill, the word "pure." As subsection 3 now reads, it would appear that an article which is not pure might be labelled "maple sugar" or "maple syrup" provided the word "pure" be not used. I think the word "pure" should be omitted out of both lines.

Mr. BLONDIN (Translation): Am I to understand that my hon. friend suggests that the section should be read with the words "pure maple", omitted?

Mr. DEMERS (Translation): No, simply with the word "pure" omitted. So, I move that subsection 3 be amended by omitting the word "pure" in lines 6 and 7, so that the end of this subsection may read as follows:

As is likely to make persons believe it is maple sugar or maple syrup.

If we adopted the Bill as it now reads, a manufacturer or other person who would label his articles simply "maple sugar" or "maple syrup" could not be prosecuted because he would have labelled it "pure maple".

Mr. BLONDIN (Translation): The purpose of the section is to prevent the use of the word "maple" on syrup compounds as, for instance, "mapling." So this part of the section reads as follows:

Which is not pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup shall be labelled or marked in such manner as is likely to make persons believe it is pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup.

If I understand the Bill, it tends to prevent the use of the word "maple" or "érable" in any shape and seems to cover the point raised by my hon. friend, if I understood him properly.

Mr. DEMERS (Translation): I differ from the minister and am still convinced that if we wish the Bill to attain its object, the word "pure" must be omitted in lines 6 and 7.

Mr. BLONDIN (Translation): There is no harm in adopting the amendment of the hon. member from St. John and Iberville, and I move that the word "pure" be omitted as he has indicated.

Mr. BUREAU (Translation): Why?

Mr. BUREAU (Translation): We prohibit the use by the merchant of the word "maple" or "érable" on his articles, unless they be pure, but as the Bill reads, the provision apparently would not apply to the crates; in other words, the Bill does not mention the crate containing the tins the contents of which may be adulterated.

Mr. BUREAU (Translation): In subsection 3, we omit the words, "resembles maple sugar or maple syrup and which." Would it not be better to omit all the words up to "and any article" in the seventh line, because the words contained in the Bill between the second and seventh lines have been put there only in case you should have allowed the sale of certain mixtures or imitations of maple syrup?

Mr. BURNHAM: I do not wish to disturb the hilarity of the meeting; but any one who knows anything about maple syrup knows that maple syrup may be pure yet disgusting. Maple syrup drawn from trees that grow on low ground is simply putrid. If, therefore, the minister wishes to guarantee to the public that the maple syrup shall be good, he will have to adopt some other method than simply to say that it shall be pure.

Mr. BUREAU: Subsection 3 says:

Except as herein otherwise provided, the word "maple" shall not be used, either alone or in combination with any other word or words, or letter or letters, on the label or other mark, illustration or device on a package containing any article of food, or on any article of food itself which resembles maple sugar or maple syrup and which is not pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup.

Why not strike out the words, "resembles maple sugar or maple syrup and which?"

Mr. BLONDIN: I beg to move:

1. That section 1 be amended to read as follows:

1. Section 29a of the Adulteration Act, chapter 133 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, as enacted by chapter 19 of the statutes of 1914, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"29a. No person shall manufacture for sale, keep for sale, offer or expose for sale, or sell, any article of food resembling or being an imitation of maple sugar or maple syrup, or which is composed partly of maple sugar or maple syrup and which is not pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup.

2. Any maple sugar or maple syrup which is not up to the standard prescribed by the sixth schedule to this Act, or, if such standard is changed by the Governor in Council, to such standard as the Governor in Council may from time to time prescribe, shall be deemed to be adulterated within the meaning of this Act.

3. The word 'maple' shall not be used, either alone or in combination with any other word or words, or letter or letters, on the label or other mark, illustration or device on a package containing any article of food, or on any article of food itself, which is not pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup, and no package containing any article of food, or any article of food itself, which is not pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup, shall be labelled or marked in such manner as is likely to make persons believe is is pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup, and any article of food labelled or marked in violation of this subsection shall be deemed to be adulterated within the meaning of this Act."

Mr. BRODER: Would the standard referred to permit the use of any other sugar with maple sugar? When maple sugar is analysed, one cannot say whether other sugars are in it or not, because the ingredients are the same in both cases. That is a difficulty that has to be overcome.

Mr. BLONDIN: I have here the standards for maple sugar and maple syrup, which I can hand to my hon. friend.

Mr. BRODER: I shall be glad to have them.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLONDIN: I move that the word "pure" be struck out in the sixth line before the words "maple sugar" and the word "pure" in the seventh line before the words "maple syrup."

Amendment agreed to.

On subsection 3 of section 1—use of word "maple" restricted to pure maple sugar or syrup:

Mr. BLONDIN: I move that the following words in the second line of page 2, after the words "maple syrup," be struck out:

And no package containing any article of food, or any article of food itself, which is not pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup.

Mr. GLASS: I would like to understand this matter a little better. The chief sites of the manufacture of maple products are in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and there is a strong desire amongst the people in the part of the country from which I come that the fullest protection should be given to the honest product of the manufacturer of honest maple sugar. What is the reason for deleting this portion, which primarily the minister considered of sufficient importance to be incorporated in the Bill? It may be all right, but I do not understand it.

Mr. BUREAU: I made the suggestion as a result of the change made in section 29a of the existing Act by striking out that part of the section authorizing the compounding or imitation of syrup. It was necessary to repeat the same words in section 3 of 29a, but, having been struck out where they first occurred the words had no meaning or use in subsection 3. The effect of dropping these words is that it is not permitted to put the word "maple" on anything except on the pure stuff.

On section 2—re-enactment of sections 31 and 32:

Mr. BUREAU: What are the changes in sections 31 and 32, of the old Act?

Mr. BLONDIN: Section 31 is amended by adding the words "and not less than $25 and costs" in subsection b, after the word "costs" in the third line. In the Act as it now stands there is no minimum fine.

On section 3—false label or neglect to label:

Mr. KAY: Does this mean that the manufacturer of maple sugar or syrup must put a label on his article?

Mr. BLONDIN: The intention is to reach the vendor of an article resembling maple syrup and provide for a higher minimum penalty and also for an additional penalty for each subsequent offence, which section 37 as it is at present does not provide for.

[Mr. Blondin.]

Mr. KAY: It does not mean that the farmer must label his sugar or syrup?

Mr. BLONDIN: I do not think it does. I think the words, "neglects or refuses to label or mark any article of food or drug refer to the general law. I do not think there will be any difficulty as it stands at present.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—application of penalties:

Mr. BLONDIN: The intention of this amendment is to give one-half the fine to the person who gives information or otherwise helps in the detection of violations of this Act. It is expected that this will be a great help to the department in the application of the law, and the detection of all violations thereof.

Mr. BUREAU: I see this is to repeal section 40 of the old Act. Was there a similar provision in the old Act? I am not going to enter into an academic discussion of the principle of giving half the fine to an informer, but I do not see why the Act should be changed. There is no department in the whole Administration that has so many inspectors as the Department of Inland Revenue, and I do not see why the minister should need extra assistance from the outside public. I am willing that the producer should be fully protected, but I say that this will give an opportunity to unscrupulous men to attempt blackmail. For instance, under the provincial regulations in regard to liquor licenses there have been cases where complaints have been made by informers, who when the trial came on had no evidence whatever, and the department had incurred a lot of expense for nothing in getting samples and having them analysed. This will just give an opportunity to some men to go around leg-pulling with the merchants and threatening to lay information against them for dealing in a product that is not within the provisions of the Act. Considering that the minister has at his disposal a great number of inspectors who go around the stores every day in the year, and have the privilege of taking any samples off the shelves and forwarding them to the laboratories for analysis, I do not see why this inducement should be given to the blackmailer.

Mr. BRODER: The department cannot have an inspector in every sugar bush, and some of this dishonest work is done in the sugar bush as well as in the shop; that is,

dishonest sugar makers will use refined sugar and that sort of thing to increase the quantity of their syrup, and it is a difficult thing to get at that. The officials in all the departments here at Ottawa would not be sufficient to watch all the sugar bushes in the country. We want to protect the honest man.

Mr. BUREAU: If you get an honest man to lay the information, I am with you; but generally it is a scoundrel that does it.

Mr. BRODER: The fact is that with all the inspection we have there is a lot of spurious syrup being sold in the shops of Ottawa to-day. So far, the enforcement of the law has not been effective.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member for Dundas knows very well that it is not the honest, respectable kind of citizen that will turn informer. The only persons who will do this kind of work are those who expect to make a little money out of it. If a man has a grudge against another he may try to get even by laying information and getting the penalty under this section. The honest man who has any complaint to make does not need this inducement. If I know that somebody is cheating the public, I will tell the inspector to go down to So and So and take a sample of his syrup for analysis, because I have reason to believe it is not what it ought to be. But this proposal to give half the fine to the informer will not appeal to the respectable element of the community.

Mr. BLONDIN: I might remind my hon. friend that the information is given to the officers of the department, who ascertain whether the sample is adulterated. I think that is a safeguard against the abuses of which my hon. friend is afraid.

Mr. MARCIL: In cases of prosecution under this law, in whose name is the case made out?

Mr. BLONDIN: I am not quite sure, but in the name of the department, I think.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Might I call the attention of the minister to the remarks of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). This legislation which the minister is introducing of giving power to the informer to prosecute is becoming obsolete. It used to be very common in former days, but in recent legislation it has been eliminated. Only two days ago the Finance Minister struck out a similar provision in the new Taxes Bill.

Mr. GREEN: I do not think that any harm will be done to the honest dealer or manufacturer. It is certainly true that with all the machinery the Government has, it is impossible to put a full check on all the avenues of deception that are possible. I think that this provision is perfectly proper, but I think that the word "may" in the third line should be changed to "shall." I should like to know why the payment of a fine to a man who is entitled to it, should be optional with the department. If it is right that the man should be paid for giving this information, let him have the remuneration to which he is entitled by virtue of this Act.

Mr. BUREAU: If you are going to do that, why not state the exact amount which the informer shall receive, and let us put it in the Bill?

Mr. BOYER (Translation): The provisions of this section contain nothing, to my mind, that is new. There are many acts in existence which impose fines that are either wholly or in part handed over to the informer.

The hon. member for Three-Rivers (Mr. Bureau) fears that it may become an instrument of blackmail. I do not entertain the same fear. The person who is accused of selling an adulterated article will not be sentenced simply on the information being laid, because before anything is done the officers of the Department of Inland Revenue will make a test of the sugar or syrup complained of to find out if the act has really been violated as alleged. I believe the provision is preventive and will have some deterring influence. I am therefore in favour of the section.

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to put in a few remarks regarding this Bill. I have listened to what has been said by the minister and it seems to me that the proposal made by him and incorporated in the Bill that it be allowed to put on the market adulterated maple sugar or syrup, is objectionable and should be rejected.

Mr. BLONDIN (Translation): Amendments have been adopted and this section was struck out. I believe the hon. member was not present at the time.

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Translation): So much the better. If I understand rightly, it will then be illegal to label the crates

with the words "maple syrup" coupled with the word "compound."

Mr. BLONDIN (Translation): My hon. friend was absent and I shall for his information summarize the amendments. The new Act does not modify essentially the old Act; it merely changes the wording so as to facilitate the enforcement of the old Act as it now stands. We have omitted only those words which might make the law more difficult of enforcement.

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Translation): I understand that under the Bill now under consideration, the sale of maple syrup or sugar is prohibited unless it be pure.

Mr. BLONDIN (Translation): Strictly pure.

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Translation): Otherwise by allowing the sale of an adulterated product, would have meant the destruction of the maple industry, which is such a source of profit to our farmers, and I, for one, should have objected.

Bill reported.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

PROPOSED GOVERNMENT OPERATION.

On motion of Hon. Frank Cochrane (Minister of Railways and Canals) the House went into committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act and amendments thereto, and to provide that the Minister of Railways and Canals may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, lease or otherwise acquire that portion of the railway of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company known as the Lake Superior branch, extending from Lake Superior Junction to the city of Fort William, in Ontario, including terminal facilities and accommodation works of the said company, or of any other company, and, for all the purposes of section 9 of the said Act, may provide, by purchase, lease or otherwise, rolling stock and equipment, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and such other company, shall each be authorized on its part to deal accordingly with the said line of railway or terminal facilities and accommodation works as the case may be; that subsections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of section 361 of the Railway Act, and section 29 chapter 122 of the statutes of 1903, shall not apply to any such lease or to anything done under the preceding provisions; that the Government Railways Act shall apply to any line of railway including terminal facilities and accommodation works so leased or acquired; and that the expenditures made under the Act to be founded on this resolution, or under chapter 43 of the statutes of 1914, shall be a charge against the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

[Mr. Lafortune.]

Mr. COCHRANE: The object of this resolution is to take authority to operate the Transcontinental railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, providing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company do not enter into a lease to do so, and also to authorize some arrangement for a lease, or running rights, from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William. The chief engineer of the Transcontinental railway has given a certificate that the road is complete for operation. The Government have no desire to operate this road, and we are willing and anxious that the Grand Trunk Pacific shall enter into an arrangement for operating it, but providing they do not do so, we want to take authority to pay the expense of operating it out of the consolidated revenue fund. The reason we have taken this matter up by way of resolution, instead of asking for a vote in the Estimates, is that we have made no estimate of what we would require to operate the road this year. We hope that the Grand Trunk Pacific will enter into a lease, but they have not come to a decision yet, and we do not know what amount of traffic we may have to provide for. If business continues as it is to-day on the Intercolonial railway, we could use some of our rolling stock on the National Transcontinental railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, this is quite a far-reaching proposal. I am afraid it goes farther in its wording than the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals thinks or has expressed to the House. Under this proposition the Government could expropriate that branch line and all its elevators and the elevators of any other concern at Fort William without their consent. I do not know whether the Government intends to do that or not. Let me read, in order that the committee may see whether I am correct or not:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act and amendments thereto, and to provide that the Minister of Railways and Canals may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, lease or otherwise acquire that portion of the railway of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company known as the Lake Superior branch, extending from Lake Superior Junction to the city of Fort William, in Ontario, including terminal facilities and accommodation works of the said company or of any other company.

Under this resolution the Government is taking the right not only to lease, if the Grand Trunk Pacific is willing to lease, but to expropriate.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think the terminals belong to the Grand Trunk Pacific; they belong to another company.

Mr. GRAHAM: You may expropriate them no matter from whom.

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Those are pretty large powers for the Government to take. Suppose there are reasons why the lease is not entered into by the Grand Trunk Pacific at the present time. The Government now takes power to take the property of the Grand Trunk Pacific away from it in the meantime or to take the terminals belonging to any other company at Fort William for its own purposes. Suppose it should transpire that after the railway is completed, as it is not now, the company would be ready to enter into a lease under the agreement, this Government would own the terminals belonging to some other company, or to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Government would also own that portion of the line from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William, some 180 miles in length. Would not that complicate the situation? I submit that it would. While I think some arrangement should be entered into for the present by which somebody will operate this road until such time as it is fully completed, it would be a mistake for the Government to go as far as to purchase very expensive property, either by expropriation or otherwise, some of which does not belong to this company at all, because the Government would have this property on its hands at the time when a lease could be legitimately entered into with the Grand Trunk Pacific. The situation would be reversed; the Government would be trying to get the Grand Trunk Pacific to take something from it in the way of purchase or release. It might be that the other companies who own these terminals would be placed in a very peculiar position as well as the Government. The line ought to be operated by somebody, but I think it is clear from the correspondence that the Government is not in a position under the agreement to lease the line at present to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. I do not say, mark you, that the Government is not in a position to make an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to operate on some terms, or with somebody to operate on some terms, or to operate the road itself, but the correspondence clearly shows that the line is not completed as provided for in the agreement between the company and the Government. The fact remains that the terminals at Quebec are not completed and will not be completed for a year or two. The station that was to be constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the joint use of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific railway in the city of Quebec, so far from being completed has not yet been started. The small station at Champlain market has only just been commenced. The Government has purchased a line to reach from its main line down to the workshops at the city of Quebec, but that line is not completed because the Government is this session asking for money to put it in a usable condition. The shops, which have been declared by Sir William Whyte and acknowledged by every railway man to be part of the system, are just being started in the city of Quebec, and this road cannot operate its through traffic even if it paid no attention at all to the city of Quebec without having repair shops in that city.

Mr. COCHRANE: How do they run from Winnipeg to the Coast without shops?

Mr. GRAHAM: They have smaller shops at points.

Mr. COCHRANE: So have we.

Mr. GRAHAM: That does not alter the fact that these shops are a part of the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. Sir William Whyte's finding absolutely stated they were part of the road, and if they be not part of the road why is this Government building them under the agreement? Another point is that the Prime Minister said in the city of Quebec, and the plans distinctly show it as presented to the House at one time, that a tunnel was to be constructed in the city of Quebec as part of that scheme, and that tunnel has not been started, and no tenders have been asked for to construct it, and I doubt if there are even plans for it.

The terms of the lease, so far as the payment is concerned, were to be based on the cost of the road, and this road not being completed, how can the rentals be arrived at before the Government knows what the cost of the road is going to be? I had better not put it that way, however—that the road is not completed, the Government admits in this correspondence, and it also admits it in the Estimates before us, because $5,000,000 are asked for to be expended on the Transcontinental railway, and it may be that even that sum will not complete it.

I am pointing this out to show that the Government should hesitate before entering into a permanent arrangement, because nobody knows yet, so far as I can find in the correspondence, that the Grand Trunk Pacific is not ready to take over this road when the Government has completed it and is ready to hand it over to them. To make clear the position taken by the Government, I shall refer to the corespondence. The Chief Engineer of the National Transcontinental Railway, Mr. Gordon Grant, has said the road is completed for operation, but in the same letter in which he states that, he has some strong qualifications. In the correspondence between the Government and the Grand Trunk Pacific it is positively admitted that there are works now under construction for the National Transcontinental railway which are not completed and will not be completed for some time. It is also shown that there are many places along the line where the company does not admit that the work is completed, and the company's engineer asks the Government's engineer to have a joint inspection made, so that they might arrive at just what the real conditions are. To show that I am borne out in my supposition that the road is not completed, I shall refer to the correspondence of the Government with the company. I find on January 13, 1913, this letter to the Minister of Railways from the President of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company:

Dear Sir,—In view of the completion of the National Transcontinental railway, I think it desirable that the necessary con-
4 p.m. ferences should be had, and arrangements made for the drafting and settling of the lease by the Government to the company of the Eastern division, which is stipulated for by the agreement of the 29th July, 1903.

The terms of the instrument are of course provided for and generally determined by the provisions of the agreement, but questions will doubtless arise in the drafting which will require consideration and settlement by the parties, and I think that suitable disposition should be made for taking up this work without delay. Probably it will be well that your legal agents and those of the Government should confer upon the subject, and I shall be glad if you will issue the necessary instructions with the view to getting the lease ready for execution. I shall be pleased to hear from you on this subject at your earliest convenience.

Yours very truly,
F. Cochrane.

E. J. Chamberlin, President,
Grand Trunk Pacific Company.

On January 14, the very next day, the President of the Grand Trunk Pacific replied thus:

[Mr. Graham.]

Dear Mr. Cochrane,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th instant, stating "that in view of the completion of the National Transcontinental railway you think it desirable that the necessary conferences should be had and arrangements made for the drafting and settling of the lease by the Government to the company of the Eastern division, which is stipulated for by the agreement of the 29th July, 1903."

As you further state, questions will doubtless arise in the drafting which will require consideration and settlement by the parties. Apart entirely from the important question as to whether or not the National Transcontinental railway has been completed as contemplated by and in accordance with the agreement to which you refer, it appears to me that before any substantial progress can be made in the direction indicated in your letter, the question as to the sum, which, as representing the cost of construction, the company is to be asked to pay interest on under the agreement, must be considered and determined.

I feel sure that you fully recognize the very great importance of this phase of the question and would therefore respectfully request that you be good enough to furnish me with a statement of such cost at as early a date as reasonably convenient.

Very truly yours,
E. J. Chamberlin.

Hon. F. Cochrane.

In that letter Mr. Chamberlain refers to the sum on which the rental is to be paid, which is the entire cost of the road when completed, and which, I submit, cannot be ascertained until the road is completed Secondly, he refers to the great question whether the road is completed or not. On January 18, Mr. Gordon Grant submitted a letter to the Minister of Railways as to the cost, I presume in pursuance of information asked for in Mr. Chamberlin's letter. The letter is as follows:

January 18, 1915.

Hon. F. Cochrane,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In accordance with your request of the 15th instant, I hand you herewith a statement showing the cost of construction of the National Transcontinental railway from Moncton to Winnipeg. You will note that the total cash expenditure to date amounts to $149,-479,550.02, and that, adding the interest, as per the terms of clause No. 15, National Transcontinental Railway Act of 1903, the total is $170,-123,191.75. Add to this unpaid estimates, approximately $1,900,000. The total to date is $172,023,191.75. The above total does not include anything for contractors' claims, which I now have under consideration, and which may be settled amicably or in the Exchequer Court.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) Gordon Grant,
Chief Engineer.

It will be remembered that that is only the cost of the railway to date. I presume that that would refer to December 31, as the letter is dated January 18?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: That total does not include contractors' claims, which may be referred to the Exchequer Court or which may be settled amicably. It is clear therefore that the actual cost had not been arrived at even at that date.

The Minister of Railways submitted this statement to Mr. Chamberlin on January 23. His letter is merely a submission of the figures, and therefore I need not read it. On January 25, Mr. Chamberlin acknowledged the receipt of that letter. On February 2, Mr. Gordon Grant, Chief Engineer of the Government, writes to Mr. Woods, Acting Chief Engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. His letter clearly explains itself. It is pointed out that the construction and the acceptance of this road is subject to the joint action of the Chief Engineer of the Government and the Chief Engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Without this joint acceptance, there can be no real finality as to the completion of the road. The letter is as follows:

February 2, 1915.

H. A. Woods, Esq.,
Chief Engineer or Acting Chief Engineer,
Grand Trunk Pacific railway,
Winnipeg, Man.

Dear Sir,—Under section 7 of the schedule of the National Transcontinental Railway Act, 1903, it is stipulated that the work to be done on the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the Government and the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The Government is of the opinion that this provision has been complied with in every way; but to put the matter of acceptance into desirable form, I enclose herewith formal acceptance which I have executed as chief engineer for the Government, and I would ask you to kindly sign as chief engineer or acting chief engineer for the company. The enclosure is in duplicate, and you are at liberty to retain one of the copies for the company.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) Gordon Grant,
Chief Engineer.

Accompanying that was a form of joint acceptance for the Chief Engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific to sign. He refused to sign that form, as he contended that the road was not completed. I will read his letter a little later on. There is another letter from the Minister of Railways, which I think in fairness to him I should put on Hansard, to make the record fairly complete. It follows up his letter of January 23, in which the figures of the chief engineer were given. The letter is as follows:

February 3, 1915.

E. J. Chamberlin,
General Manager Grand Trunk Pacific Ry.,
Montreal, P.Q.

Dear Mr. Chamberlin:

With further reference to my letter of 23rd January, in which I enclosed the statement of the cost of construction of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway, I beg to point out that it is not intended that the item therein inserted as necessary to cover the completion of certain works shall be included at the present time, in the amount upon which interest should now be calculated. What may be incomplete is not at the present time an essential portion of the National Transcontinental railway, and it is only upon the cost of the work as completed that it is proposed to calculate interest now. This cost the Government is having a report upon by auditors, and the result of the report will be made known to you in due course.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) Frank Cochrane.

That letter, of course, states quite clearly that the amount given in the former letter is not considered the final amount upon which the rental shall be based, because the minister says in so many words: This amount is up to December 31, 1914; but at a later date, when the road is completed—that is the only inference that can be drawn—the total cost of the National Transcontinental will be computed and the interest on that amount will be the rental finally decided upon under the lease and the Act of 1903. That clearly indicates that the minister does not think the road is completed. The chief engineer takes the view that the road can be operated as it is at present, but the minister and all the correspondence admit that the road is not completed under the agreement.

Mr. COCHRANE: Is a road ever completed?

Mr. GRAHAM: It might be said that a road is never completed, and I think the minister says so in one of his letters; but it can be completed under an agreement, although it may be everlastingly requiring changes. The minister's letter makes it clear that he thinks the road is completed so that it can be operated.

On February 3, there is another letter in which the minister again urges the company to execute the lease, and he refers to the amount to be expended in rolling stock for the equipment of the eastern division, $5,000,000 being the amount?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister urges that the company prepare to furnish the rolling stock for the equipment of the eastern division. It is quite clear that that is the substance of the letter.

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no request in that letter to execute the lease?

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps the request to execute the lease was prior to that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was later.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is another letter in the file under date of February 3, but I think it is merely a duplicate of the letter which I read a few minutes ago. Mr. Chamberlin replies to this correspondence on February 5—merely a formal acknowledgment. On February 9, the Solicitor General writes to the chief engineer, but as this is only in reference to telephone lines, it is not necessary in the argument I am making. On February 10, Mr. Gordon Grant, the chief engineer, replies to the letter of the Solicitor General in reference to telephone lines.

Now I come to the reply of Mr. Woods, the acting chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, to the letter of Mr. Gordon Grant, chief engineer of the Government, in which he enclosed a joint acceptance to be signed by Mr. Woods, and which the latter declines to sign. Here is the reply of Mr. Woods:

Winnipeg, Man., Feb. 11, 1915.

Mr. Gordon Grant.

Dear Sir,—I have yours of February 2, file 12,259, in which it is stated that in the Government's opinion the National Transcontinental railway is now completed, and with which you enclose form of acceptance which you desire me to sign certifying, in fact, that the National Transcontinental railway is completed and satisfactory to this company. This is the first intimation I have ever received that even the Government consider the line fully completed, and that you also consider it completed. Your opinion in regard to this is different from my own, and I have therefore to say that I cannot sign the acceptance committing the Grand Trunk Pacific railway to the agreement proposed in your letter. I think before such an acceptance can be given there will have to be an inspection of the line throughout, and of the many items I think are incomplete an understanding will have to be arrived at as to what shall be capital charge in such cases.

Yours truly,

H. A. Woods.

Thus, Mr. Woods says in so many words that there are many items which the company thinks are incomplete, and that before the company can think of joining in the acceptance, an inspection will have to be made, particularly of those portions which the company say are incomplete, so that a decision may be arrived at as to what capital charges will be allowed—

Mr. BURNHAM: Did the hon. gentleman, when he was in office, provide for ascertaining the meaning of the word "complete"?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is provision made for arbitration and so on, I think. I cannot recall the details at this moment. It was not to be "complete"; a thing cannot be "complete," but it was to be "complete" under a certain agreement.

Mr. BURNHAM: How was that to be ascertained? In what state of affairs would you inform them that it was complete and they be required to take it over?

Mr. GRAHAM: The terms of the agreement say that the road as constructed shall be accepted by the chief engineer of the company and the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and if any difference arises it is to be referred to a board composed of these chief engineers and a third party of their choosing; and if they do not agree as to the third member of the board, the Chief Justice of Canada shall make the appointment.

Mr. BURNHAM: Was the board's decision to be final?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is in error, and I do not think he wishes it to go on record that way. The agreement makes no such provision as to the question of completion.

Mr. GRAHAM: It does as to acceptance. It must be subject to joint acceptance, and if there be a difference as to the construction—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not as to completion.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say "completion;" I used the word "construction." If the line is "constructed" it must be "completed." Let me read section 7. We are at a point now where what we do is of national importance. I want to have the case stated with exact fairness. The question raised at this moment has no bearing on the argument I was making, but I will read the clause and hon. members can judge what they are to understand from it as business men:

In order to insure, for the protection of the company as lessees of the eastern division of the said railway, the economical construction thereof in such a manner that it can be operated to the best advantage, it is hereby agreed that the specifications for the construction of the eastern division shall be submitted to and approved of by, the company for the commencement of the work, and that the said work shall be done according to the said specifications and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the Government and the chief engineer of the company, and, in the event of differences as to the specifications, or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the questions in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator, to be chosen in the manner provided in paragraph four of this agreement.

I am not versed in the law, but, speaking as a man who has had a little business experience, I take that to provide explicitly that if the engineers could not agree as to when the work was fully performed they were to refer the matter to arbitration. I do not think any other meaning could be taken out of that clause.

Now, let me go back to the correspondence. Here is a letter to the Solicitor General from Mr. Gordon Grant. It refers to the enclosure sent to Mr. Woods. Some of this correspondence directed by the Chief Engineer to the Solicitor General is merely a repetition of what I have read already. Now I come to the letter of Mr. Chamberlain in reply to the Minister of Railways. I may say so that the committee will understand clearly, that this is a letter in reply to a letter from the Minister of Railways urging the company to make provision of the rolling stock necessary for the operation of this road. Mr. Chamberlin's letter is as follows:

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway,
Montreal, Can., February 15, 1915.

Dear Mr. Cochrane,—I beg to acknowledge your communication of the 3rd instant, in regard to the provisions of the agreement of 29th July, 1903, relative to the providing of equipment for the eastern division. In reply I would call your attention to Clause 20 of the agreement, which as you will see provides that "when completed the said eastern division shall be leased to and operated by the company for a period of fifty years." Clause 22 also indicated—

I take it, that should be "indicates."

—quite clearly that the equipment of the value of $20,000,000 to be provided, of which $5,000,000 worth is to be supplied for the operation of the eastern division, is to be the first equipment for the completed road. I do not understand that the Government claims that the eastern divisions is as yet completed in accordance with the agreement, and your other letter to me of the 3rd instant bears me out in this. That being so, you will, I think, agree that it would be improvident and unwise on the part of the company to proceed to acquire under the present unfavourable conditions, equipment involving the expenditure of so large a sum, and which pending the completion of the line would to a very great extent at least, not only remain idle, but materially decrease in value.

Yours very truly,
E. J. Chamberlin.

Hon. Frank Cochrane,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

The president of the Grand Trunk Pacific formed the same opinion that I have of the letter of the Minister of Railways, because in making the assertion that the road was incomplete he says: "and your other letter to me of the 3rd inst. bears me out in this." He is convinced by the letter of the Minister of Railways—which, I think, must convince anybody—that in the mind of the Government, while the road might be fit for operation in a sense or partially, it was not completed as provided in the agreement with the company.

This is merely a letter from the Solicitor General forwarding a letter of Mr. Woods to the minister, to which I referred. On March 6, the Solicitor General wrote a letter to the chief engineer, which I think ought to be put on record:

March 6, 1915.

Gordon Grant, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, National Transcontinental
Ottawa.

Dear Sir—Referring to your letter of the 23rd February and to the refusal of Mr. H. A. Woods, acting engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to sign the acceptance dated 2nd February, 1915, it is to be noticed that Mr. Woods appears to base his refusal upon the claim that the road cannot be said to be completed within the meaning of section 20 of the agreement schedule to the National Transcontinental Railway Act, 1903. Mr. Woods, I presume, has in mind certain portions of the work which at present, or rather at December 31, 1914, the date up to which the audit is being made, may be said to be under construction. I have always understood, both from yourself and from the commission, that although there are such portions that are still under construction, the same are not essential for the immediate operation of the entire line, and consequently that it would not be reasonable to wait for their completion until the said section 20 was acted upon.

Would you be good enough, therefore, to state if in your opinion the eastern division was on the 31st of December, 1914, completed so far as is essential for the efficient operation of the entire line at that time and now. Also, would you kindly detail with such definiteness as you can, such portions as were on such date still under construction, and in respect of which expenditures had been made chargeable against the cost of construction but which were not said to be taken over as part of the leased premises and enjoyed by the lessees. May I

add that the list which you will so kindly give, is to be used for the purpose of determining by audit the cost of such portions with a view to their not being included for the present, in the cost of construction.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) Arthur Meighen.

The Solicitor General surely admits absolutely in that letter that the road is not completed, except, as contended by the Government, sufficiently to be operated, in a measure at least, but not completed under the agreement; because from that letter of the Solicitor General to Mr. Gordon Grant, the inference is clear that there will have to be a later statement of the cost as a basis for the final determination of what the rental is to be. I will read that again, because there is no question that that is the contention—that the road is not completed under the agreement, but is completed so that it may be operated, in a measure at least, which we all want to see. This is the last sentence of the letter of the Solicitor General to the chief engineer:

May I add that the list that you will so kindly give is to be used for the purpose of determining by audit the cost of such portions with a view to their not being included for the present in the cost of construction.

Mr. Gordon Grant replied to that as chief engineer, and it is necessary to give his reply, dated just a few days ago, to the letter I have just read:

Ottawa, March 10, 1915.

Hon. Arthur Meighen,
Solicitor General, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Answering your letter of 6th inst., I may say that I intended the certificate dated February 2, 1915, (which I signed and forwarded in duplicate to Mr. H. A. Woods, chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, for him to sign) to be a certificate that in my opinion, as chief engineer of the National Transcontinental railway, it is completed and ready for operation within the meaning and intent of section 20 of the agreement scheduled in the National Transcontinental Act, 1903.

You are aware that Mr. Woods has refused to sign the above acceptance, as he is of the opinion that the line should first be inspected before it is accepted, but otherwise does not mention anything in particular as not being completed.

As you state that Mr. Woods may have in mind any work now under construction, and ask me to give you a detailed list of such work as may not be ready to hand over as part of the leased premises,—

1. I may instance the approaches to the Quebec bridge. They are completed, but will be of no value to the company as part of the main line until the bridge is completed.

2. The Leonard shops, Quebec. They are not completed, but we hope to have them available by the time they are required.

3. The branch lines into the Leonard shops will not be required until the shops are sufficiently completed to be used.

4. Quebec joint terminals are as yet not completed. Should the Government wish to deduct from the total cost of the road up to December 31, 1914, the money expended, with interest thereon, for the above-mentioned items by reason of the fact that the company will not obtain any immediate use of these facilities, I would recommend the following deduction be made:

1. South side approach to Quebec bridge, paid by this commission exclusive of that paid by the Quebec Bridge Company, and not included in the estimated cost of this line (2.4 miles), $530,000.

Cost of north side approach to Quebec bridge, $150,000.

Cost of Leonard shops, land, buildings, etc., $1,138,000.

Cost of branch line to Leonard shops, $200,000.

Quebec terminals, $382,000.

Total, $2,400,000.

This is a liberal estimate and includes an ample allowance for interest charges, so that no additional deduction should be made on that account.

I may also add that it is quite questionable whether a deduction should be made for the north approach to the Quebec bridge ($150,000), as the company will be using this greatly to their profit in bringing in steel, etc., for the erection of the bridge. They will not, however, be using that part of the line on the south side, for which I have deducted $530,000 until the bridge is completed.

I might say that there is a fine distinction here, properly so that Mr. Gordon Grant is only referring in this to the amount already expended on uncompleted work, and he figures the items of cost which should make up the amount that ought to be deducted from the lease now being executed. As this work is not entirely completed, the company would have no use of these works until they were fully completed, but of course they would belong to the company under the lease when fully completed. I agree with Mr. Grant as to the approaches to the Quebec bridge; and I might say, in passing, that I think the Government will find that the company has no ground to complain about the non-completion of the Quebec bridge as part of the line. I think there is correspondence on file in which it is admitted by the late Mr. Hays that a ferry would be considered a completion of the line. Such a letter was written.

Mr. COCHRANE: They deny it now. I agree with my hon. friend that there is enough on file to establish it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I know that such a letter was received, and I cannot conceive of its going astray. It was received in connection with some other correspondence.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will remember that at the time the letter was received I immediately took it to Council to show that the contention of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company on that particular point had been conceded by them. But, even on this, let me see if my contention is not admitted by the chief engineer. He takes first the Leonard shops as not completed. The Leonard shops are to be part of the work as completed; everybody admits it. If they are not, then the Transcontinental Commission should not be charged with them. It may be possible to operate the line partially without these shops, but they are part of the scheme under the agreement; there can be no question about that. Mr. Grant then says:

> The Leonard shops, Quebec, are not completed, but we ought to have them available by the time they are required.

They are certainly not available now; they will not be available for a month after the shop buildings are completed, as they have to be fully equipped, which is no small task; and no person will contend that these shops will be ready for months and months yet. Mr. Grant admits that this part of the equipment of the line is absolutely uncompleted.

So this is the position. The branch lines of the Leonard shops will not be required until the shops are sufficiently completed to be used. First, the shops are not ready and will not be ready for a good many months; and secondly, the line is not ready, but it will not be needed until the shops are ready. That reminds me of the old story that so many of you have heard about the school board down South that met to discuss the question of erecting a new school-house. First, they resolved to build a new school-house; secondly, they resolved to build a new school-house out of the logs of the old school; and thirdly, they decided to continue to use the old school-house while they were erecting the new one. And so it is with these shops. The shops are not completed, but they will not be needed until the road is ready; and the road is not completed, but it will not be needed till the shops are ready. That of course is not an answer to the question, Is the road completed? I think that is very clear, so far as Mr. Gordon Grant is concerned. He admits this part of the scheme is not complete. Then there is a letter from the Solicitor General just forwarding this correspondence. These accounts were referred for audit to Mr. W. C. King and Mr. Graham Bell. Mr. Bell is head of the auditing branch of the Department of Railways and Canals, and there is not a better man in the service of the Dominion in any department. Let me just read their letter:

> Ottawa, March 23, 1915.
>
> Dear Sir,—Referring to the Order in Council of February 3, 1915, appointing the undersigned to make an audit of the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway.
>
> We beg to call your attention to a letter received from the Solicitor General, a copy of which is hereto attached, from which it appears that the "cost of construction" of the eastern division as completed on the 31st December, 1914, within the meaning of section 20 of the agreement scheduled to the Act of 1903 should not include expenditures made on and in respect of certain works which were still under construction. The result will be that the "cost of construction" as a basis upon which to ascertain the rental to be paid by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company at this date will be very considerably less than the actual cost upon completion of the said additional works now under way.
>
> Is it your desire that our report should include the statement of such actual cost as well as the "cost of construction" as so limited?
>
> Yours respectfully,
> (Sgd.) Graham Bell,
> (Sgd.) W. C. King.
>
> Hon. F. Cochrane,
> Minister of Railways and Canals,
> Ottawa, Ont.

These gentlemen when asked to audit these accounts immediately pointed out that the accounts they were asked to audit did not cover the full cost of the Transcontinental, and that the rental computed upon those accounts would be considerably less than the amount which the country ought to receive on the full cost of the construction of the road when completed. The next is a letter from the Minister of Railways to the Solicitor General enclosing the report prepared, I think, by Messrs. Bell and King. On the 25th of March, just a few days ago, the minister wrote another letter to Mr. Chamberlin in which he urged the railway to action. I believe that no reply has been received to that.

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will read the letter, as it is the last one sent to Mr. Chamberlin.

> 25th March, 1915.
>
> Dear Mr. Chamberlin,—As intimated to you in previous correspondence, the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway is completed within the meaning of section 20 of the agreement between His Majesty the King and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, dated 29th day of July, 1903, scheduled to the National Transcontinental Railway Act, chapter 71 of 3 Edward VII, and the said division is ready for operation.

I find a reference in your correspondence to certain additional works still under construction by the Transcontinental Railway Commission, which additional works it was contemplated by the commission and by your company would be ultimately used in connection with the road as now completed. The Government, however, having been advised that the eastern division for purposes of operation, has been reported by the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway Commission as completed and ready to be leased, is of the opinion that it is in the public interest that such lease be now entered into. You will readily understand that were any other interpretation as to date of completion to be placed upon the agreement with your company it would mean the postponement for a very considerable length of time of the taking over of this extensive line of railway by the Grand Trunk Pacific, with results that might be incompatible with the public interest. Such a postponement would be to a date very hard, if not impossible to determine, as in one sense a railway can never be said to be complete. The responsibility for such a postponement I must decline on behalf of the Government to take.

The Government have under section 15 of this agreement ascertained the cost of construction, in the manner therein provided, and in so doing have included only such expenditure as has gone into work on the eastern division as now completed and ready to be leased.

I therefore request that the lease referred to in sections 6 and 20 of the above mentioned agreement be entered into. The Government has had prepared a form of lease embodying the provisions required to be included in the same by statute and by agreements between your company and the Government. The rental reserved is based on the cost of construction ascertained as aforesaid. This lease I now hand you on behalf of the Government. You will observe attached to the form of lease is a Schedule B, which schedule should contain a description of the rolling stock marked and assigned by the company to the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway. I trust that such rolling stock as the statute directs has been provided and assigned accordingly, and as particulars of the same are now not in our possession,I would request that the schedule be duly filled in by you.

On behalf of the Government I beg to request that this lease be executed by your company and assuming that the schedule as so filled in will represent rolling stock fulfilling the conditions of the agreement, and provided and assigned as therein set out, I undertake that this lease will be promptly executed on behalf of the Government.

It has been and is my desire that there be nothing contained in the lease as drafted and now presented not strictly provided for by statutory requirements, and nothing omitted directed by statute to be included. This desire I believe is lived up to in the form of lease enclosed. Should however, in your opinion the form contain any feature to which reasonable objection can be taken, or omit any necessary provision, I am prepared on behalf of the Government to confer with your company and to endeavour by every proper means to come to a common basis, and I will make every effort to do so consistent with the requirements imposed on us by statute.

That you may have before you the method by which the cost of construction, and consequently the annual rental, is arrived at, I am enclosing you a copy of the report of our auditors thereon and of the schedules thereto annexed.

Yours very truly,

There is no signature, but I presume the letter was written by the Minister of Railways.

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister says in his letter that he is enclosing the report of the auditors. The auditors themselves tell the minister in a letter that the rental based on their audit would not be the full rental which the company ought to pay, as that rental up to December 31, 1914, would be based on the uncompleted cost, the entire work of construction of the line not being completed. I think that is a fair statement of the letter I have read. It is admitted that the rental now arrived at will be for the present only, and that another rental must be arrived at when the works are completed. That is the tenor of the correspondence. If that were not the case the Government would have to meet the railway company and come to an arrangement as to the cost of the completion of the works, the interest on that amount to begin as rental from the time of completion of the now uncompleted work. There is no chance of getting out of putting in all these works as part of the cost of construction. If the Government could make an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Pacific I would hold up both hands for it, but I think that the correspondence indicates that the Government is not prepared to execute a lease under the agreement, as the transcontinental railway is not complete.

Mr. COCHRANE: To relieve my hon. friend's mind on that point, I may say that we have not put it all in; we have only put in what they can use, and other parts will come in afterwards.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is just my point. It is an amicable arrangement. The minister says that he only proposes to put in now so much of the scheme as it is claimed is completed and the balance is to be put in afterwards.

Mr. COCHRANE: Deducting the Quebec bridge and things of that kind which they cannot use at the present time.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will try to make that clear. This letter has reference to the money expended to date, but it has no reference to the money to be expended.

It refers to money already expended on works not complete. The company claim that they have no right to pay interest on works incomplete when they are not in a position to use these works. The situation is very clear—that the Government, under the agreement, is not in a position to execute the lease because they cannot tell the company what the cost of the road is. They can tell what the cost of the road is up to date, but the Quebec station is not completed and that is included in the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific. Shops are being constructed by the Transcontinental Railway Commission, which is the Minister. The Champlain Market station is not completed. A line to connect the shops with the main line at Cap Rouge has been purchased from the Canadian Northern Railway, and there is an amount in the Estimates now to make that road fit for the traffic of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The terminals in Quebec city are not completed; they are scarcely started. They will not be completed for months and months, if not for more than a year; they cannot possibly be. That being the case, should we not approach this matter in another way, instead of saying to the Grand Trunk Pacific: We take it for granted that you are not going to take over this line, and we are going to operate it ourselves? We are not entitled to say that under the agreement, because we are not prepared to hand the road over in the completed state.

Mr. BURNHAM: Why was it not arranged in the first place that it would be amicably taken over?

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot tell my hon. friend why it was not; I am speaking of the agreement as it exists. We are all bound to admit that it is in the interest of the country that this road should be operated. We all agree as to that, but we want to arrive at some way by which it can be operated in a measure, that is with the exception of the uncompleted work, and that finally the company can be asked to take it over under lease. But we are not in a position to do that now and we are not in a position by reason of anything the company have done to expropriate their property, as this resolution proposes to give the Government power from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William. A practicable arrangement ought to be made in some way for the operation of this line until the Government can say to the company: Here is the whole scheme completed; are you going to take it over or are you not? If not, we can run it ourselves and we are going to take over your line from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William. But at the present time the Government are not in a position to say to the company: You must take over this line, and if you do not you will violate the agreement, because, I submit, the line is not finished according to the agreement. I am firmly convinced that some arrangement ought to be made for the operation of the road.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would not a practical arrangement of that sort be a surrender?

Mr. GRAHAM: It would not be a surrender because the road is not completed. If the road were completed it would be a surrender. The correspondence shows that it is not completed except for the purpose of operation and it is not available for complete operation in my humble judgment. As to taking over the road finally; I am glad that the correspondence does not indicate that the compar' has declined to take over the road. If the Government go about it in a peaceful manner I think some arrangement could be made for the operation of this line and for the use of the Superior Junction—Fort William line if necessary until such time as the Government have the undoubted right to say to the company: We have fulfilled our part of the agreement; are you going to execute this lease? I would go a little further. Speaking for myself as a private individual I do not know that I would object to seeing this Government operating the Grand Trunk Pacific in connection with the Intercolonial railway. In that I am speaking for myself solely. If the time ever came that there should be a disagreement and the company should decline to take over the road, which I do not think it will do, a worse thing could happen to the Dominion of Canada than that the Intercolonial should be hitched up with the Grand Trunk Pacific and given its own line through to the western provinces. However, that is by the way. The point I was urging on the Government was, first, the necessity of operating the line in some way, and I was cautioning them that they were not going about it in the right way, because I believe the better judgment of the people will lead them to the conclusion, after seeing the correspondence, that under the agreement the line is not completed, and that the Government is not in a position to execute a lease

except of a temporary kind even if the company were willing to agree to it.

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask the hon. gentlemen why it is that this idea of his was not carried out before?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend and I were not in the House at the time or we might have had all these things provided for. Unfortunately, the Dominion was without our services and Parliament seemed to take another view.

Mr. COCHRANE: There are only one or two things in regard to which I desire to take issue with my hon. friend (Mr. Graham). The first is in reference to the entrance into the city of Quebec. The Grand Trunk Pacific could run their trains into the Canadian Pacific railway depot and right down to the docks and use the Canadian Pacific railway terminals at present. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) shakes his head.

Mr. GRAHAM: You are mistaken about what he is shaking it for. I said to my right hon. friend that that had nothing to do with my argument that the road is not completed under the agreement.

Mr. COCHRANE: But they might run in there and have all the facilities that the Canadian Pacific railway have to-day for handling the traffic. There is a mistake in Mr. Grant's letter in that respect. I am not finding any fault with my hon. friend for making the statement he did upon reading Mr. Grant's letter. But the actual fact is that the Grand Trunk Pacific could run into the station and go right down into the terminals and docks there. Another point is that I understand the Grand Trunk Pacific take the ground, though not in writing, that the road is not completed until the Quebec bridge is completed. That means that it will not be completed before 1917. I think it should be ready in 1917.

Mr. GRAHAM: If they do they have not a leg to stand on.

Mr. COCHRANE: Perhaps they may not have a leg to stand on but that is the argument they make.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would like to see it in writing that they take that ground.

Mr. COCHRANE: I have gone over the Grand Trunk Pacific in daylight from Moncton to Winnipeg, and if the Grand Trunk Pacific claim that the contracts which they themselves tendered on and got are completed, then I will put up the other contracts alongside of them and say that they are completed also. I am not an engineer but I take a commonsense view of it and I absolutely say that if their contracts are completed then the other contracts for the balance of the road are also completed. Now, I desire to say a word in reference to the shops. Almost any lawyer will tell you that it is a debatable point whether we are required under the Act to build the shops at Transcona or not, but if the Transcona shops had been built somewhere near the centre they would have taken care of a haul of 1,800 miles and would have served a better purpose. There is no question about that, because the shops are large enough in every respect. We have as many miles of road on the Intercolonial, and we have not as good shops at the different divisional points as there are on the Transcontinental railway, which, I may say, are exceptionally good on every division, so that, even if they did not have the shops at Quebec, they could get along far better than they could on their own line from Winnipeg west. I know that the equipment at each of the divisional points of the National Transcontinental is far superior to the equipment of the shops on the other divisions, because I have been over a good portion of that road and went through the shops and saw for myself.

I must take issue with my hon. friend when he says that the chief engineer for the National Transcontinental Railway Commission and the chief engineer for the Grand Trunk Pacific can settle the dispute as to whether the road is completed or not, by calling in a third arbitrator. I do not think he has any ground for interpreting the Act in that way. On the question of construction, the engineers can follow that procedure, but as to the completion of the road, there is no definition in the Act as to what "completion" is. The point I want to make there is that if the chief engineer for the company continued to hold out and to say that this road is not completed, he could find excuses until the end of time, and he would never admit that the road was completed.

Mr. GRAHAM: The third arbitrator would not side with him.

Mr. COCHRANE: Perhaps not, but at all events the procedure referred to by my hon. friend is as to construction, and it has no reference to completion, and there is a big difference between the two. If there is a

dispute between the two engineers as to how a piece of road or a bridge is to be constructed, an arbitrator may be called in, but the completion is a different question altogether. On the piece of road from Graham to Lake Superior Junction, which my hon. friend took over from the Grand Trunk Pacific, there are quite a number of wooden trestles, which we have not filled, and when their usefulness is ended it will be up to us to fill them in or to put in steel and concrete.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the two miles of road?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes, but again on McArthur's work there are wooden trestles. These are things that must continue for some time, and under the Act, as I understand it, there will be capital charges year after year, so that the House 5 p.m. will be continually voting certain sums for capital charges to improve and extend the Transcontinental. I do not think there is any doubt about that. We might, of course, never get the chief engineer of the Company to say that the road was completed, and so they could carry this contention on forever.

My hon. friend said that we were going about this in the wrong way, but I can assure him that there is no desire on the part of the department or of the Government to go about it in the wrong way. We feel that the road is in shape for operation now. We feel that, even with these other works that are not completed, they have absolute facilities for operating the road to accommodate all the business there will be for years to come. I think it is only fair and just that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company should enter into this agreement and carry out their part of the bargain.

I understood that another submission which they have made is, that they will enter into an agreement to operate a road costing $60,000,000, and they say they do not want to enter into an agreement for a road that has cost $180,000,000, or whatever it may be. That, of course, is a big difference.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not in the correspondence.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is not, but I understand that it is one of the contentions they set up, and probably it will be stated when they answer my letter, but perhaps I should not have mentioned it here.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does this sum of $169,061,354.80 include compound interest over the whole period?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the interest as provided for by section 20 of the Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is compound interest capitalized to the end of the year during which the expenditure was made, and then simple interest from that on?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I believe so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am inclined to think, judging by the figures, that it is compound interest right straight through, which, if it is so, is contrary to the agreement.

Mr. COCHRANE: I will find out about that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is simple interest.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It should be simple interest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understood the Minister of Railways to say that the reason he brings this resolution before the House is that the road is now completed and ready to be operated, and that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are declining to live up to their agreement and refuse to take the road and operate it.

Mr. COCHRANE: They have not refused yet. This legislation only provides for the contingency of their refusal. If I did not make that clear, I want to make it clear now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understood from the minister that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, while not actual ly refusing to operate the road, did not comply with the request made by the Minister of Railways to operate the road. I can very well understand that the Grand Trunk Railway Company are not anxious to operate the road, after the road has been deteriorated and blemished as it has been. A railroad is not complete when the roadbed has been prepared and the rails laid; it must have terminals at each end. As soon as this Government came to office, the question was raised whether or not the terminals of the road were part of the construction, and the question being referred to arbitration, the award went against the contention of the Government.

Mr. COCHRANE: Do you refer to the award of Sir William Whyte?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes. The award of Sir William Whyte settled the principle that the terminals are part of the construction, and, therefore, there must be

terminals at Winnipeg, as there are, and also terminals at Quebec, which the Government is now providing. The minister is aware that there has been a total change made in the terminals as proposed at Quebec. The other day the Minister of Railways stated that his object was to administer his department in a businesslike manner and in no other way; that his only consideration was the interest of the country, and that he would not allow politics to enter into his administration. I give full credit to my hon. friend that when he made that statement he meant it; but if it be his object, as I believe he intended it to be, that in the administration of the important department he has in charge he has nothing in view but the interest of the country, the interest of the railway, and the interest of his department, how can he contend that the changes which he made in the terminals at Quebec were in the interest of the country or of the railway?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have no hesitation in saying that I think they were.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend thinks so, and I cannot put my judgment against his, because I do not pretend to be a railway man; but everybody whom I have heard discuss the question has declared that the changes made at Quebec were detrimental to the railroad and to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway which was obliged to operate that road under that agreement.

As to the shops, when the late commission had charge of that road, they bought 300 acres of land for the purpose of erecting shops. Where should the shops of a railway be built? Is it not common sense that they should be built by the side and upon the level of the railway? The site for the shops provided by the late commission was at Cap Rouge, by the side of the railway and near the bridge. My hon. friend tells me now that that site has been discarded altogether, and that the shops are to be located nine miles away from the railway; yet my hon. friend will say that it is in the interest of the road and of the country that that should be done. Although my hon. friend says that, from his experience and on his responsibility as an adviser of the Crown and as a trustee of the people, to remove the shops from Cap Rouge, where they were just on the level of the roadway, by the roadside, and to place them nine miles away, is in the interest of the country, every one will say that it is contrary to common sense. There is no possible excuse for changing the site. My hon. friend has been at Cap Rouge, and he knows that what I am stating now is absolutely true. At Cap Rouge there are 300 acres of good ground on a rock foundation. At St. Malo there is a swamp, and the site is nine miles away from the road. It is not possible to use the shops at St. Malo unless every car which is sent from the railway to the shops passes over a line of something over nine miles. My hon. friend, in order to reach the shops, has had to buy from the Canadian Northern at a cost of $175,000, an old line, which was built in an inferior manner and which will have to be improved very much in order to bring it up to the standard of the rest of the road. That expenditure would have been saved to the country if the old site had been retained. From the date of the changing of the site to this, I have not heard a single explanation from the minister—and I shall be glad to hear one from him in a moment or two—as to how he can justify his action in changing the site of the shops from Cap Rouge to St. Malo. The shops at St. Malo will be at least 150 feet lower than the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific where the former site was. The distance between the site at St. Malo and the railway is so great that when the late Postmaster General, the Hon. Mr. Pelletier, announced it to the people of Quebec, he said that in order to reach the shops a tunnel would be built from the line of railway to the shops. For the benefit of those who do not know Quebec as the minister and I know it, I may say that the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway is in the valley of the St. Lawrence, and that the shops are not in the valley of the St. Lawrence, but in the valley of the St. Charles river. Between the valley of the St. Lawrence river and the valley of the St. Charles river rises Cape Diamond which will have to be tunnelled in order to extend the railway to the shops and to bring the shops within reasonable distance of the main line. My hon. friend says that the site was changed in the interest of the country. I will not dispute that; I will leave the matter to the country to decide. The minister has not brought down a scrap of paper, from the time that he so acted up to this moment, to show that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has ever agreed to the change. That company, so far as I have been able to find out from all the papers brought down by my

hon. friend, has never consented to that change. My hon. friend (Mr. Graham) a moment ago quoted the law that the specifications had to be agreed upon by the engineer of the company and by the engineer of the Government jointly. It was agreed that the shops were to be placed at Cap Rouge beside the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. Therefore the change could not be made legally, and to-day the Government is at the mercy of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. To-day that company says: This road will not be completed until the contract which we made and the specifications upon which we agreed have been carried out to the letter. My hon. friend, when he acted as he did, may say that he acted with a view to helping the country and the company; but when he did so, whatever may have been his motive, he placed himself in the power of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and he cannot compel them to execute the lease.

There is another point. A railway must have a station. This railway, in order to meet the object for which it was intended, must be brought down to the tidal waters of the St. Lawrence at Quebec, and it is so brought down. Then there must be a station. Every one will admit that. When the question of determining where the station should be came before the late commission, they consulted all the parties interested; they consulted all the railway companies and all the steamship companies which come to the city of Quebec; they consulted the Quebec Central Company, the Intercolonial Railway, the Delaware & Hudson Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Railway Company and even the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. On a former occasion I quoted the deliberations of all the interested parties. They consulted the Allan line, the Donaldson line, the White Star line and all the other steamship companies which come to Quebec. The decision was then made that the best site on which to place a station was the Champlain market. They proceeded accordingly. They bought from the city of Quebec the Champlain market for $100,000. They started to prepare plans for the station, and they gave a contract for it. When the present Government came into power, they cancelled that contract. The indemnity given to the contractors for the cancelling of the contract for the building of the station at the Champlain market amounted to some $36,000.

Mr. COCHRANE: I think it was $26,000. I am not sure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Why did they cancel the contract? Why did they not build the station where it was intended to be placed? They said that they wanted to have a union station for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. My hon. friend knows that, between the point of junction of the railway and the tidal waters and the Canadian Pacific railway station, there is a distance of fully three-quarters of a mile, and that again Cape Diamond must be tunnelled in order to reach the station of the Canadian Pacific railway, or the line must go through the busiest part of the city of Quebec. My hon. friend knows—if he does not everybody in the city of Quebec must be of the opinion—that this station is not half so useful for the purpose of the enterprise as the station that was discarded. Moreover, though he cancelled that contract and changed that station, he was compelled to admit later on that he had made a mistake; for last year he had to come back and ask this Parliament for an appropriation for the building of a station at the very spot which he had discarded three years before. Is this in the interest of the country? And who can say that in so acting my hon. friend has acted in the best interest of the road? Will it be said that it was on the question of cost that he so acted? Let us look at that. The land at the market station cost $100,000. The station was to cost $1,000,000—making the total cost of station and site $1,100,000. What will be the cost to the country under the contract which my hon. friend has made wih the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? The papers brought down to-day show that for the Canadian Pacific railway property as it exists to-day a capital charge is admitted of $3,295,000. The expense for the new station will be $2,000,000, and land yet to be acquired will cost $1,075,000. This makes a total cost of $6,370,000, on which the country will have to pay 2½ per cent, or $142,000 a year. So, it cannot be said that it is for reasons of economy that this change was made. Moreover the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that this new Canadian Pacific railway station is of no use whatever to the Grand Trunk Pacific unless a tun-

nel is provided to go under Cape Diamond from the valley of the St. Charles to the valley of the St. Lawrence. I repeat, these changes of the station were made without the consent of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. If I am wrong, I am ready to be corrected, but certainly there is not a syllable in the papers brought down by the Government to show that I am wrong. I assume, unless I am contradicted, that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company never agreed to the changes made.

Well, Sir, when these changes have been made by the Government regardless of the contract entered into with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, it is not extraordinary that the company do not rush forward to take over the road. Their agreement was based upon certain terms; and the Government ruthlessly and without the consent of the company threw aside the agreement made. Now they tell us that the road is completed to their own satisfaction and therefore the company should take it over. It is no wonder that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company declares that it is not prepared to take over the road.

The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago that he understood the Grand Trunk Pacific will not take over the road, but contend that it is not completed because the bridge is not completed. If that is the objection raised by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, I have only to say that nothing of that kind appears in the correspondence. There is not a word of it. He said also that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company refused to take over the road because they thought the cost too heavy. If that is their pretension—and I do not think it is—there is not a word in the correspondence brought down to show it. I know there is one thing in the correspondence that has been brought down, and that is the protest of the company against the degrading of the road.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In what letter is that found?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not say that that is in the correspondence brought down to-day; that was in the correspondence to which attention was called a year or more ago.

So I repeat what I have said: the Government have put themselves in the power of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and cannot compel that company to take over the road. Let them go before any court to compel the carrying out of this part of the contract, and the company will say: You have not lived up to your agreement; the road is not completed, and we will not take it.

These are preliminary remarks to the consideration of the merits of the resolution brought forward to-day by my hon. friend. We shall have to deal with that later on. With regard to the observation made by the Solicitor General that the contract was deficient, I have to say that the contract is full and complete, made by the best lawyers we could engage. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick was Minister of Justice when the contract was prepared. Not satisfied with his own efforts, he called in Mr. Gormully, solicitor of the Bank of Montreal, and Mr. Shepley, of whose reputation I need not speak. These were the parties who prepared the contract. There is enough in the contract, as I stated a moment ago, to force the implementing by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company of their undertaking. But the Government have placed themselves in such a position that they cannot force the company to act.

Mr. COCHRANE: I take issue with my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as to what was laid before the late Sir William Whyte, the arbitrator. As I understand it—and I was there when the agreement was drawn up and read—the Grand Trunk Pacific wanted to use not only the Transcona shops but also the road down to join with their road at Lake Superior; and it was to find out what they should pay for the use of the shops separately and what they were to pay for the use of the railway. He made his award on that and we have carried it out.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not a complete award.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is a complete award so far as my memory carries. I have not it here. They were to pay 2 per cent on the cost of the road down to Lake Superior, 10 per cent on all work done for the use of their rolling stock from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, and 12½ per cent on any rolling stock repaired at these shops of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Now, with reference to the St. Malo shops and the changing of the site. I am confident that the country believes that the change was good not only in the interest of the road but in the interest of the city of Quebec. The shops are five miles outside the terminal in Quebec of the Transcontin-

ental road. He says they are nine miles outside.

Mr. GRAHAM: You run right by them with your road.

Mr. COCHRANE: We run right by them into the city of Quebec, to the Canadian Pacific Railway station.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not the same line, that is away from the bridge.

Mr. COCHRANE: That may be.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Away from the bridge and away from the river also.

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes. We have 200 acres there which was bought at as low a price as the other.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Pardon me.

Mr. COCHRANE: Well, I think in proportion a great deal cheaper.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Pardon me.

Mr. COCHRANE: The other was bought at $300 an acre, and this at $1,000 an acre.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The land at Cap Rouge was $300 an acre and the land at St. Malo $1,000 an acre.

Mr. COCHRANE: $200,000; yes, and a good bargain at that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I hope so.

Mr. GRAHAM: For the fellows that sold it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was the change to St. Malo approved of by the company?

Mr. COCHRANE: I am not so sure of that, and that is why I did not answer the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister will find that out?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes. I have nothing to hide in this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not suggest that you have.

Mr. COCHRANE: I want to take issue with the right hon. gentleman in reference to the Champlain market. I do not think there is a business man in Quebec who will not agree that the change is in the interest of the city of Quebec, when you consider that you have to go to the Champlain market over those little narrow streets, one with a street railway on it, and not large enough for the existing traffic, and haul your train around by way of the Canadian Pacific railway station. That would certainly not be in the interest of Quebec in any shape or form. There is no room there to have a proper terminal. I think it is in the interest of the country that there should be union stations wherever possible. This may cost a little more, but the terminals are far better. I had a good example to follow, that of the old Commission in making joint terminals in the city of Winnipeg. The Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific there use the one terminal, and the interest charges in Winnipeg will be nearly as high as in the city of Quebec. In reference to the tunnel, is it in the interest of the Transcontinental or of Quebec, or of the country, that we should build a tunnel which would cost probably a million, or a million and a quarter, or a million and a half of dollars, and have the company pay interest on it before the business there calls for it? I make the statement again that the Transcontinental railway, if they started running to-morrow, could run right down to the Canadian Pacific Railway station, use that station in connection with the other line and go right down to the Louise basin and make their terminals there.

The hon. gentleman said that the Canadian Pacific railway agreed that the Champlain market was the best place for a station. A very eminent railway man, Mr. McNicol, told me it was not a fit place for it, and he was at that conference.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I agree that he is a good man to the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. COCHRANE: If I understood my right hon. friend, and I do not want to misquote him, he said that the Canadian Pacific railway had agreed that it was the best place.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I did not say that. I said all the companies. The Canadian Pacific railway was at the meeting. I did not say that the Canadian Pacific railway agreed, but all the others certainly did agree.

Mr. COCHRANE: He is certainly a good railway man.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: From the Canadian Pacific railway standpoint, no better, and he showed it in the contract he made with my hon. friend.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think so, and I am willing to stand by that, not

withstanding my right hon. friend. We have heard a good deal about degrading the road. I have no less an authority than Mr. Chamberlin for the assertion that we took the right position in that, and surely he is interested—he is president of this road.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCHRANE: And he said that we could take out the grades, if it was thought in the interest of the road, for one-half what the old commission was paying.

Mr. MARCIL: Who recommended these changes in Quebec?

Mr. COCHRANE: The commission.

Mr. MARCIL: Did a board of railway engineers recommend them or how were they brought about?

Mr. COCHRANE: They were brought about by the commission, just as they were brought about in the first place.

Mr. ARTHUR LACHANCE (Quebec Centre) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the resolution before the House gives authority to the Government to lease or otherwise acquire that part of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway known as Lake Superior Division, between Lake Superior Junction and Fort William, in Ontario, the power to be exercised in case the company refuse to operate the Transcontinental. The contract made in 1903 between the late Government and the company provides that the company has to take over the railway only after its completion. Now, the road is not yet completed according to the terms of the contract, and that is one of the reasons given in the correspondence brought down before the House by the Minister of Railways why the company is withholding its signature to the lease recently submitted to it by the Government. Among other incomplete works on the road, the company mentions the whole of the work on the terminals in Quebec city and harbour. I wish to make a few remarks on this last point. I regret to say that the company seems to have taken a correct stand. Not only the terminals are not completed, but I should even be justified in stating that they are barely started. As a matter of fact, from the information given the House during this session, we find that during the year, as well as during the past three years, no progress has been made in the construction of these terminals in Quebec city and harbour, and that the only activity manifested by the Government since it is in power has tended to destroy rather than build. Its indifference and apathy can neither be explained nor condoned.

A few words on the conditions that existed in 1911. The railway had been built up to the city; the foundations had been started for a station at Champlain market to cost $1,000,000. Many millions of dollars had been voted to construct deep water wharves 1,800 feet in length in the region of Cape Diamond, the terre-plein that would be left to be used for yards, sidings, freight-shed and elevator sites. The interested parties, the city of Quebec, the Transcontinental Railway Commission, the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the Government, had acted jointly to devise this whole scheme that was to take two years to complete, after which time the Transcontinental would itself be ready to operate its trains from the Atlantic to the Pacific. But as soon as the Borden Government came into power, it upset all these arrangements which were both advantageous and logical. They stopped the work between Quebec and Cap Rouge, and in the meantime there has been nothing doing in that region; between Cochrane and Quebec as well everything moves at a snail's pace. For constructing 35 miles of grading and 88 miles of track, which remained to be done in that section in November, 1912, and which required at most a few months, a whole year was spent, the road having been completed only in November, 1913. That premeditated delay was doubtless intended to facilitate the cogitations of the new president of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, Major Leonard, on the problems of slopes and curves; but we realize how as a result of those cogitations the traction power from Cochrane to Quebec and even to Moncton, was impaired. At the beginning of the undertaking in 1905, the engineers had determined the grades over the whole line from the Atlantic to the Pacific, as follows: slopes runnings east, four-tenths of one per cent or 21 feet per mile; slopes running west, five-tenths of one per cent or 26 feet per mile, then later six-tenths of one per cent or 31 feet per mile. It must, however, be stated that slopes were to be avoided except where it would be impossible to obtain an absolute level. By means of these very gradual slopes, a locomotive could pull double the weight that it could draw on any other road now in operation in this country. Now, between Cochrane and Quebec, Mr. Leonard has increased the slopes from 21 feet to 100 feet per mile of road, with the necessary result that a locomotive, having pulled as long a train as its power would allow from Prince Rupert to Cochrane,

would not be able to proceed to Quebec without dividing the train into two sections. The objectionable character of such a condition of things need not be pointed out. The efficiency of the road was impaired without any justification.

But as regards Quebec itself and the construction of the terminals, I claim that since October, 1911, the Government's action has been ineffective, and at times even destructive. What about the shops that were to be put up at Cap Rouge for the building and repair of cars? The Government is building them at St. Malo, with only half the capacity first decided on, and only for repairs. The Quebec Board of Trade has entered a protest against these changes in its report for 1914. At page 124 may be found a letter from its president, Mr. Joseph Picard, dated the 5th of December, 1914, to Hon. Thomas Chase Casgrain, the new Postmaster General, which reads partly thus:—

> The construction of the Transcontinental Railway car shops at St. Malo, is progressing satisfactorily; but those car works have no shops for the construction of cars, as were to have the carworks which had been planned at first for Cap Rouge. We were given the assurance that this omission would be rectified, because Mr. Chamberlin has stated that the Transcontinental will require for car construction as extensive facilities as any other transcontinental system.

We ourselves have also during last session entered protests, but in vain, and you will find that the board of trade's representations will likewise have no practical results.

Then, to connect these carworks with the railway, the Government had to purchase from the Great Northern Railway five miles of line at a cost of $175,000 to which three miles had to be added at a cost of ten to twelve thousand dollars. And all that expenditure was made when it would have been so simple and logical to build them at Cap Rouge where they would have been in close touch with the main road and where must pass all the rolling material of the Transcontinental from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

As to the terminals themselves, namely the stations, yards, freight sheds, elevators, they were to be located in the vicinity of Champlain market and Cape Diamond. Thus located close to the deep water wharves, they would have been part of the Transcontinental system and intended first of all for its own service and under its direct control. Now the Government want them built in the valley of the river St. Charles, on the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, where, in all likelihood, they will be of service to and under the control of that company especially. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had agreed to the first plans; and now refuses to accept the others because, if those plans were carried out, the company would be dependent on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Notwithstanding these objections, the Government persists in its new proposals; but the consent of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is a necessary condition under the contract made in 1903 between it and the late government. However it may be, the consent or refusal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to the proposed changes do not in any way justify the Government's apathy for more than three years.

Yet, since October 1911, the citizens of the city of Quebec, particularly through their board of trade, have constantly urged the construction of those terminals; their solicitations were never more pressing and frequent than during 1914, but were always fruitless. Thus at page 69 of the annual report, I find the following to have taken place at a meeting of the board of directors held on the 2nd of June:

> His Honour Mayor Drouin, being invited to report on his recent interview with the members of the Government at Ottawa respecting the work on the Transcontinental, complied willingly. The board was not satisfied with the explanations given by the members of the Dominion Government concerning the delay in the construction of the terminals of the Transcontinental at Quebec, particularly of the freight sheds or stations. It was then decided to send a deputation to Ottawa, and a telegram was sent immediately to the representative of the Quebec district in the Dominion cabinet, Hon. L. P. Pelletier, asking him to name a day and hour for an interview with the deputation.

As I turn over the leaves, I find a minute at page 70 which is an answer to the statement of the minister of Railways that the terminal facilities of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Quebec were sufficient for the traffic on the Transcontinental. Here is the note:

> On the 9th of June, the board sent to the Hon. L. P. Pelletier a letter informing him that the elevator built on the Louise jetty by the Harbour Commissioners will scarcely be of any use for the local trade, because besides the sum of $2 per car charged by the Harbour Commission for the use of the sidings on the Louise jetty, the Canadian Pacific Railway charges the excessive rate of 2½ cents per hundred pounds for the use by the same cars of its own sidings, or rather for the use a few hundred feet in length, that is $15 for every car of 40,000 pounds capacity; there is moreover $1 per car to be paid at the elevator for the loading of each car, which means the excessive total charge of $18 per car.

And that is the elevator which we are asked to believe would according to the new government scheme satisfy for the requirements of the traffic on the Transcontinental, when this very elevator, under its present management and on account of the railways interested in it, can hardly handle the local trade.

To further show the groundlessness of the statement made by the Minister of Railways regarding Quebec's ability to cope with the handling of the freight at that place, I again quote from the report, at page 75, of a meeting of the board of directors held on the 12th of June, 1914:

Mr. Jean Guay points out the delay in the construction at Quebec of the terminals for the Transcontinental Railway. By means of small topographical charts which he distributes among the directors, he shows that there is no general plan of the whole works, that no provision has been made either by means of a tunnel or otherwise for connecting the car works at St. Malo with the Transcontinental Railway; that the new grain elevator of the Harbour Commission could hardly be utilized by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. He adds that a representative delegation should go to Ottawa and interview the Government on this subject, so that precise information may be obtained that could then be communicated to the members of the Board of Trade at a special general meeting that could be held in ten days or so.

The Chairman points out that it is hardly possible to obtain in just a few days precise information and that it would be better to adjourn *sine die* or else call that meeting whenever it will be necessary.

So, here we are in June, 1914, after three years during which the Government have had under consideration this question of terminals, yet the president of the Board of Trade has yet been unable to obtain precise information. Besides, even we members of this House have never been able to get anything definite in the way of information.

About that time, the Government seems to have been somewhat inclined to revert to the original scheme of elevators and deep water docks at Cape Diamond. Thus, at page 91 of the report, there may be seen a letter, dated the 2nd of July, 1914, written by the president to Hon. L. P. Pelletier, then Postmaster General:

Dear Sir,

I have communicated to the council of the Board of Trade the result of our recent visit to the terminals which are to be constructed at Quebec for the handling of the freight on the Transcontinental and also your decision to press the construction of the docks and of an elevator at Lampson's cove.

The directors wish me to convey to you their thanks and congratulations for this decision and their hope that these works will be pushed rapidly to completion so that Quebec may be able to handle the grain from the Northwest as soon as the Transcontinental begins to remove it to the sea.

* * * * *

We are informed that the contractor intends to construct the 2,000 feet docks which you have authorized, from Lampson's cove in a westerly direction, in the shape of a simple wharf or protecting wall, fronting on the river in a straight line. A wharf of that kind would accommodate only three large vessels and it would become necessary to construct very wide and expensive galleries leading from the elevators; while if docks were constructed on the same plan as those of Halifax, St. John, Montreal and New York, there would be five times times the accommodation for an equal frontage.

On the 11th of August, the president writes another letter giving particulars about the docks at Halifax.

But that scheme of docks and elevators is entering a new phase. I have here two letters explaining the reasons of its failure:

Ottawa, August 15, 1914.

Mr. Jos. Picard,
President of the Board of Trade,
Quebec.

Dear Sir:

In further reference to your letter of the 11th inst., I beg to forward you a copy of the reply received by me from Hon. Mr. Cochrane, relating to the docks intended to afford terminal facilities for the handling of freight on the Transcontinental at Quebec.

Yours very sincerely,
(Signed) Louis P. Pelletier.

Ottawa, August 14, 1914.

Hon. L. P. Pelletier,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Pelletier:

I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 13th inst. with enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. Jos. Picard, president of the Quebec Board of Trade, and in reply to state that the harbour at Halifax is under the control of the Intercolonial Railway, and so under the direct control of my department, while the harbour at Quebec is under the control of the Harbour Commissioners, with whom I have nothing to do.

Yours very sincerely,
(Signed) F. Cochrane.

The stand thus taken by the Minister of Railways seems to me unwarranted. He states: I am concerned with the docks in Halifax harbour, because that harbour is under the management of the Intercolonial the latter being under the control of my department. But the Transcontinental is also under the control of his department, because, for the last two years, the minister has taken over the powers of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. The original plans also provided for the construction of those docks by the Transcontinental Railway Commission. Moreover the Government has constructed the docks at Levis and never claimed that it was for the Quebec harbour commission to see to that work.

The answer of the minister therefore merely evades the question, and justifies our suspicions that the Government is ill-disposed towards the Quebec terminals.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LACHANCE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, just before six o'clock, when you left the chair, I was replying to the claim of the Minister of Railways that the Transcontinental Railway was now ready to start operations, even at Quebec, and that there were in that city sufficient facilities to meet the requirements of both the passenger and freight traffics. I have already quoted from correspondence between the ministers and the city authorities, to prove that such a claim is without foundation; that there are at present at Quebec neither docks, nor elevators that could be made use of by the Transcontinental Railway and that the Minister of Railways has refused to carry on these works but has suggested that it was for the Harbour Commission to see to them.

As a matter of fact, the Board of Trade appealed to the Harbour commission. Alas, a new deception awaited them, as will be seen by the two following letters, one from Mr. Levasseur, secretary of the Board of Trade, to Mr. Renault, the other from Mr. Renault to Mr. Levasseur:

Quebec, September 21, 1914.

Mr. Raoul Renault,
Secretary-Treasurer of the
Harbour Commission.

Dear Sir:

On the 11th of August last, we sent to Hon. Mr. Pelletier, the representative of the Quebec district in the Dominion Government, the enclosed letter. I have instructions from the board of directors to communicate to you a copy of this letter, as well as the answers of the Hon. Mr. Pelletier and of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

You will notice that the Minister of Railways and Canals suggests that the works at Lampson's cove, etc., for the Transcontinental Railway terminals are under the direct control of the Quebec Harbour Commission.

M. T. LeVasseur,
Secretary.

Quebec, September 26, 1914.

M. T. LeVasseur, Esq.,
Secretary,
Board of Trade,
Quebec.

I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of the 21st inst. enclosing a letter to Hon. L. P. Pelletier regarding the work which the Harbour Commissioners are now carrying on at Lampson's cove.

In reply, I have instructions to inform you that the improvements now being effected at Lampson's cove are destined only to provide a landing for the railway ferry-boat.

Yours very sincerely,
Raoul Renault,
Secretary,
Quebec Harbour Commission.

So a peculiar situation arises; nobody is willing to take charge of the most indispensable part of the terminals, namely the docks and elevators. The Government do not concern themselves about it; the Harbour Commission will not have anything to do with it, neither will the Minister of Railways.

It would be difficult to find in the past, under any of the administrations, a similar chaos in an undertaking of such importance: no controlling head, no acting body, no definite plan, no responsible authority over the actions of the parties interested; one pulls this way, another that way, to suit personal or political interests.

And what about the famous Union station at the Palace? To reach it a tunnel had been proposed; has the work been started? The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has asked the following question:

1. Has the work been started on the proposed tunnel in connection with the maritime station of the National Transcontinental at Quebec?
2. If so, what amount has been expended on the work up to December 31, 1914?

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals answered as follows:

1. Yes.
2. $372,514.86 have been expended by the land commissioners and $154,293.83 by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the right of way and buildings.

What relation the purchase of that land and the construction of those roads and buildings can have to the tunnelling of the cliff from Sillery to St. Malo, is not easy to see. Then, what generosity has prompted the idea of connecting with the construction of that tunnel the Canadian Pacific Railway? But what can be clearly seen is that the tunnel is not under way, that many years will pass and many millions will be spent before it is completed, if ever the scheme should materialize; and meanwhile the Transcontinental will be without approaches to the station which is planned for it and without any accommodation for the handling of its freight.

To be just, I must say that last spring, the Government started work on the foundations of a freight station at Champlain market; but these foundations were barely out of the ground when the work was stopped about the end of July.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me a question? Does

my hon. friend state that the work on the Champlain station was interrupted in July?

Mr. LACHANCE (Translation): Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): Not at all. It was carried on until the snow flew.

Mr. LACHANCE (Translation): I beg the Postmaster General's pardon. I am sure of what I say because in the month of October, I happened to go several times in that locality and the work had been stopped. Besides I lately read in a Quebec paper, Le Soleil or L'Evènement, but I rather think it was in Le Soleil although I am not positive about it, that the work was stopped since the beginning of August.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): No, no.

Mr. LACHANCE (Translation): In any case, one thing is certain, and that is that the work has been stopped, for what reason I do not know, long before the snow flew. In any event, winter came; but that was no reason to interrupt the work.

So then, wretched car-works reduced to one-half their capacity at Saint Malo, and the foundation of an insignificant freight station at Champlain market, such were the only results of three years efforts on the part of the Government towards the building of the Transcontinental railway terminals at Quebec, and are what the Minister of Railways wishes us to accept as sufficient accommodation for the traffic on the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Such was the hopeless and confused tangle in which were the terminals when the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) made his exit last fall.

Then a new political star rose on the horizon, and we saluted it with pleasure.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Translation): With enthusiasm.

The Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Translation): We shall judge him by his works.

Mr. LACHANCE (Translation): We saluted with pleasure and enthusiasm the new Postmaster General who henceforth is to look after the interests of the Quebec district, and despite our many disappointments his coming inspired us with renewed hope, and the Board of Trade made a further effort. I think the Postmaster General will endorse my statement, when I say that the citizens of Quebec and all interested bodies like the Board of Trade, are not satisfied with the present conditions. He is aware how groundless is the statement of the Minister of Railways that present arrangements meet the requirements of the traffic on the Transcontinental. I need only recall that on the 23rd of October last, the president, the two vice-presidents of the Board of Trade, and the Mayor of Quebec had an interview with the Postmaster General at the City Hall. Those gentlemen expressed themselves in the following terms, as shown at pages 116 and 117 of the report:

> In June last, Mr. Pelletier and the officers of the Transcontinental, after inspecting the grounds, had promised that the work would be started immediately on the construction of docks and of a grain elevator near Lampson's Cove. As the Transcontinental is completed, and this work is still in abeyance, Quebec is in a difficult position and requests that this work be started as soon as possible.

I also quote a letter of the 24th of November, 1914, to the Postmaster General, which may satisfy the Minister of Railways that the people of Quebec are not as satisfied as he would have had us believe this afternoon. The letter is addressed by Mr. Levasseur to the Postmaster General.

> Dear Sir:
>
> The construction of the Transcontinental railway is practically completed; we may even expect that next May this great railway will be operated all along the line from Winnipeg to Moncton. Unfortunately, Quebec harbour, which is to become the summer terminal for the Transcontinental, is far from being in a position to handle the enormous traffic which our great national railway will carry from the Canadian West to the Canadian harbours. As yet Quebec can offer no terminal facilities; there are no deep water docks in front of the city, and no elevators. The result will of course be as ever it was, that the western traffic on the Grand Trunk Pacific will take the usual road to American harbours.

I also quote to the same effect from a letter written on the 5th of December, 1914, by the president of the board of trade to the Postmaster General:

> However, the only facilities now in course of construction at Quebec, are those which are being made at the Louise basin, and they provide a dock area barely sufficient to accommodate three large steamers, and a small elevator with a capacity of one million bushels, which may be reached by the Transcontinental only over the tracks of a rival railway by paying a prohibitive rate. And these facilities are not even sufficient for the traffic of the Canadian Northern which is almost completed.
>
> It is therefore evident that no provision practically has been made here for the export traffic of the Transcontinental railway during the season of navigation on the St. Lawrence, and that immediate attention should be given to that question.

All of which goes to prove that the Board of Trade, in so protesting, was voicing the sentiments of the citizens and continues as

in the past to ask that terminals be constructed in the neighbourhood of Champlain market and Cape Diamond; it also goes to prove that during the past three years the Government has done nothing effective in that direction but has always evaded the issue.

The least we can now expect is that the new minister of the Quebec District will put an end to this fumbling, that he will sincerely endeavour to fulfil the legitimate anticipations of the Quebec citizens and that he will assist the Board of Trade in its efforts. For unfathomable reasons, the Government persist in their intention to change the plans agreed upon in October 1914 and which had been stated by the most competent engineers, to be the most suitable. We, being in the minority cannot help it; but at any rate the Government might go ahead and carry out the changes they have decided upon. It is urgent, since already the Transcontinental is partly in operation. My right to make that request cannot be questioned; neither is this the first occasion on which I voice these sentiments. Pledges should be kept; and Quebec has secured both from the Laurier and Borden Governments, the promise that terminals, would be built, not mere makeshifts, but suitable terminals fully equipped with all necessary facilities for the handling of the enormous traffic which the Transcontinental railway is bound to bring. So let the work proceed. It will be in the interest of the people at large, throughout the Dominion, while giving a further impetus to the activities of Quebec harbour and of the old city of Champlain.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): I regret I cannot reply to the hon. gentleman in his own language, and I still further regret that I was only able to ascertain very imperfectly the purport of his remarks. Consequently, what I have to say will not, I hope, be considered by him as the whole answer of the Government to whatever he may have charged. I understand, however, that the burden of his remarks has been that the Quebec terminals and other facilities in the city of Quebec and its neighbourhood are not sufficiently completed to warrant the Government calling upon the company to make good their contract and take over the road. I believe he also seconds the assertion of his leader that an error has been made in the choice of the site for the terminals and the Leonard shops. In the first place, I am not able to get the connection between the burden of his remarks and the motion that is before the Chair. The motion before the Chair is that a resolution be passed, concluding that it is in the interests of the country to put the Government in a position to lease the line between Lake Superior Junction and Fort William, or, if necessary, acquire it in another way than by leasing it, and to make whatever may be necessary in the way of expenditure to operate the Transcontinental railway, that line included, a charge against consolidated revenue. Even were all that the hon. gentleman says correct, and all that the right hon. leader of the Opposition says correct, would it not be wise to pass this resolution? Would it not be even more necessary, if such were possible, than it is on the assumption that they are wrong? The resolution simply empowers the Government to lease, should it deem wise, the line between Lake Superior Junction and Fort William, on the assumption that it may for some time be the duty of the Government to operate this road, and that that line will be necessary. If the remarks of the speaker who has just sat down (Mr. Lachance) were correct, if it were true that the portion of the work at Quebec was so far from completion as he says, it would be all the more likely that we should have to operate the line, and operate it for some time, and necessary that we should operate the line between Superior Junction and Fort William.

Were the remarks of the hon. gentlemen opposite confined to the resolution, it appears to me they would be reduced to the one or two preliminary sentences of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) in which he found cause for complaint in the resolution by reason of the fact that it enabled us to "otherwise acquire" the line. It is not necessary to remind the House that enabling the Government to "otherwise acquire" is not in any sense a direction on the part of the House that anything should be otherwise acquired. The circumstances surrounding the whole transaction, and the circumstances in which we are placed to-day as a result of years of legislation and as a result of the position the work is now in, may make it necessary for us to operate the line, and those circumstances are such that it would appear to a reasonable man that our proper course in the meantime was, if possible, to lease the line between Superior Junction and Fort William. The resolution empowers us to lease it. But would hon. gentlemen opposite contend that with our negotiations with the Grand Trunk

Pacific, who are the owners of that line, we should have no alternative whatever, and that there should be no weapon in our hands that would enable us to see that a lease only on reasonable terms was entered into? Unless we have as an alternative the power to expropriate, unless, indeed, we have all the alternatives that we may be empowered to have, we may be hampered in our negotiations with the company and the company would have the advantage of us in those negotiations. It is the desire of the Government that they should have no advantage, and that we should be equipped with as many weapons as Parliament may equip us with, in order that we may enter into such an engagement with the Grand Trunk Pacific as will be fair and reasonable and of advantage to the Dominion of Canada. That is the only reason I know of why the words "or otherwise acquire" are inserted in the resolution.

I remarked a moment ago that, assuming that the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite had something in them, and that we were not in a position at present to compel the Grand Trunk Pacific to make good its engagement and lease the line, they offer no obstacle to the resolution, they offer no argument against it. If those arguments have any effect, they would make the resolution all the more necessary, and if hon. gentlemen opposite appreciate and believe in their own arguments they will be all the more enthusiastically behind the resolution. For myself, I am not behind the resolution for these reasons. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) argued very strenuously this afternoon that the time had not come when we could ask the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to lease this line. I do not know what the object of his argument was. I do not know why it should be his desire or the desire of any hon. gentleman opposite to argue in the House of Commons against the interests of the country in this regard. This is a question of fact. It is a question whether or not the condition of the road required by the terms of the agreement is such that we can ask the company to take the road over. That is a question of fact that must be left for the decision of such tribunal as we may have recourse to. The hon. member for South Renfrew argued—I do not know whether he intended to argue it or not, but I drew that inference from his remarks—that the proper tribunal was an arbitration tribunal under clause 7 of the contract. I do not take that view myself. I do not think my hon. friend took that view when he was Minister of Railways. I do not think his Government took that view of the effect of clause 7. But this Government has retained the engineer in charge who was placed there by the late Government—an engineer in whom they had confidence and in whom, so far as I know, we have no reason not to have confidence ourselves—and on a question of fact, which is a question of engineering, is it not the duty of this Government to take the statement and the certificate of their engineer. The hon. gentleman read some letters, and he repeated his inference from those letters that the road was not complete. We do not contend, we have not argued, we have not asserted that everything associated with that road is complete. That is the fault I find with the agreement. That is the fault I find with the policy of the Government in entering into the engagement they did in 1903. They seemed to contemplate the building of a railway as they would contemplate the building of a suit of clothes. They seemed to contemplate that there was a definite time at which it would commence, and an equally definite time at which all would be completed. They did not take the advice of railway men surely in a matter of this kind. I do not know of any railway in the world and I never heard of any railway in the world that was at any stage of its existence complete. And in their contract the Government did not provide any method at all by which that state of completion is to be determined, or any tribunal to which the question of its completion can be referred.

Consequently, the only tribunals I know of are the courts of the land. While there are works, such as the Quebec terminals, the approaches to the bridge, the Leonard shops and the Quebec bridge itself which are still in process, they will ultimately form a part of the line. These must be in process for years. Is it the fault of this Government that they are in process and not completed? Do hon. gentlemen opposite take the ground that they believed when they were entering into this engagement that we would have the line ready for operation and not be in a position to call on anybody to operate the road? If we assume that I am afraid we must come to the conclusion that they were not looking after the interests of the country when they entered into that agreemen. Then again, did they believe, when they signed the contract in 1903, that we

should be in this position, that the road would be ready for operation, but that because certain parts of the works, that ultimately would form part of it and would be operated in connection with it, were not completed at the time, the road should lie idle and we should not be in a position to call upon anybody to operate? Was that their intention? It must have been their intention if their argument to-day is correct.

Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they made that agreement, must have assumed that the traffic that the line would have to carry the first day it was run would be just the same as it would be four years after it had commenced to run. If not, then they must have had in contemplation just what took place, namely, that certain works would be under way prior to the completion of the line as an operatable line and would still be under way for some years after the line was operated. That is the actual state of affairs, that is the necessary result and that is a result for which there was no provision in the agreement. Consequently we are in the position we are in to-day. We have to choose whether or not the time has come for the company to take over this road, and if we find it has not come we are compelled to do what never was provided for in the agreement in the first place, namely, to operate the road until these outside works are got under way.

Does the hon. member for South Renfrew contend that his opinion on this matter is better than that of the Chief Engineer of the Transcontinental railway? Is it not a question of fact, is it not a question of railway engineering, whether the road is completed within the meaning of the Act or not? Does he contend that the certificate of the chief engineer is not as positive in its terms, is not as complete, as definite and specific as any certificate ever was? When does the time arrive? When can we call upon the company to take over the road?—when, under section 20 of the Act, is the road completed for the purpose of operation? The certificate of the engineer on that point is in these words. I find in his letter of March 10 last, addressed to myself, the following:

Answering your letter of 6th inst., I may say that I intended the certificate, dated February 2, 1915, (which I signed and forwarded in duplicate to Mr. H. A. Woods, chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, for him to sign) to be a certificate that in my opinion, as chief engineer of the National Transcontinental railway, it is completed and ready for operation within the meaning and intent of section 20 of the agreement scheduled in the National Transcontinental Railway Act, 1903.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did the Solicitor General not ask him to write that opinion? Here is your letter of the 6th.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose that the hon. gentleman contends that I fathered the opinion of the chief engineer of the road?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Undoubtedly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I must congratulate myself on possessing such dominating influence. The hon. gentleman must have great confidence in my engineering ability.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think that is a fair inference.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That I asked him to write it? We will read the letter I wrote him:

March 6, 1915.

Gordon Grant, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, National Transcontinental,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 23rd February and to the refusal of Mr. H. A. Woods, acting engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to sign the acceptance dated 2nd February, 1915, it is to be noted that Mr. Woods appears to base his refusal upon the claim that the road at present cannot be said to be completed within the meaning of section 20 of the agreement scheduled to the National Transcontinental Railway Act, 1903. Mr. Woods, I presume has in mind certain portions of the work which at present or rather at 31st December, 1914, the date upon which the audit is being made, may be said to be under construction. I have always understood, both from yourself and from the commission that although there are such portions that are still under construction, the same are not essential for the immediate operation of the entire line, and consequently that it would not be reasonable to wait for their completion until the said section 20 was acted upon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Having so understood from him, and if I had not so understood from him would he not have rebuked that sentence in his reply?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Read on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will read more than my hon. friend wants:

Would you be good enough therefore, to state that in your opinion the Eastern Division was on 31st December, 1914, completed so far as essential for the efficient operation of the entire line at that time and now.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that not a request?

Mr. MEIGHEN: A request? The chief engineer had sent the certificate to them before I wrote the letter.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why ask him to do it twice?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because at the time I wrote I did not know that his signature had appeared to the certificate. I knew that the certificate had been sent. I have here his actual signature which had been sent to me before my letter was written.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That proves the correctness of what I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Proves the correctness of what the hon. gentleman said—proves that he signed it at my request when my request was made after he signed it?

Mr. GRAHAM: The dates do not show that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly they do. I would commend the attention of the hon. member for St. John to the discussion we had and the sentence that he uttered, and which is on Hansard, about four days ago, when, after about ten pages of Hansard were consumed with certain assertions that he made, he told the House that he had not the slightest idea whether they were correct or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend does not mean to misquote. If I remember rightly, what I was professing to state to the House, and what I did state, was that I had certain information in regard to important matters concerning the honour of this House. I was not aware whether my information was correct or not, but I urged that the question was of sufficient importance for the Government to give to the House the information which I was informed it had through the agency of its own secret service officers, or else obtain the information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And after so urging for ten pages, the hon. gentleman stated that he himself had not the slightest knowledge whether he was right or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No. The hon. gentleman is entirely inaccurate in that. I was not professing to make a statement from personal knowledge at all; I was stating information which had been given to me, and I said that I was not aware as to whether or not that information was accurate.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the night is out I will undertake to quote out of Hansard what the hon. gentleman said, or what I have said he said, and if I am not correct I will apologize to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You will apologize for it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All right. I have no similar request to make to the hon. gentleman. He has admitted himself to be wrong already to-night, and no apology would add anything to his humiliation.

We, Gordon Grant, chief engineer appointed by the Government of Canada for the Eastern Division of the National Transcontinental railway, and H. A. Woods, chief engineer, of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, hereby signify our acceptance to the Government of Canada and to the said company, of the work done in respect of the said eastern division.

Dated at Ottawa, this 2nd day of February, A.D. 1915.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is that signed by anybody?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is signed by Mr. Gordon Grant.

Mr. GRAHAM: The copy that was given me had not his signature.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The original was signed by him.

Mr. GRAHAM: The copy in the return was apparently sent to Mr. Woods without any signature. I feel positive that Mr. Grant's signature was not on the copy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the hon. gentleman refers to is a copy attached to Mr. Grant's letter. The original as returned is signed by Mr. Grant himself and is in the possession of the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then I did not have a correct return.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have a copy here dated 2nd February, which does not profess to be signed by Gordon Grant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The original is signed by Gordon Grant. I will let the hon. member see it, and it was received before my letter was written.

I suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to admit that the certificate of the engineer is definite, specific and complete, and that the engineer is the judge that we are bound to take upon so important a question as this, it being a question of engineering alone. We may be right or we may be wrong; unfortunately there is no summary way of deciding it. But there would have been if hon. gentlemen opposite

had done their duty in 1903. There is only one way of deciding it. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has not so far definitely and finally taken the position that they refuse to sign this lease. They have offered objections, but whether or not they intend to press them to the point of final refusal has yet to be divulged. At all events, whatever be the finding of the court, should the finding of a court unfortunately be necessary, or whatever may be the decision of the company should the company decide the matter without reference to the courts at all, it is undoubtedly the duty of the Government at this time to put themselves in a position to operate the road to the the best possible advantage, and to meanwhile make the very best of the situation.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are not content with arguing the position of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to the effect that they are not bound to take over the road because the road is not completed, but they try to fortify the position of the company in other regards, and they assert that the road has been degraded and that the company will not take this fine line of railway, running from Moncton to Winnipeg, because it is not quite a good enough railway to take care of the traffic that is going to offer in that northern ccuntry. Even were hon. gentlemen opposite correct in that, and even did the Grand Trunk Company take exception on that ground and prosecute the taking of that exception, surely they do not believe that the people of Canada for a minute will think that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are refusing to take over the road because it is not good enough to take care of the traffic and, because, forsooth, it has not cost quite enough money.

It is asserted also by hon. gentlemen opposite that an error has been made in the city of Quebec, that there has been a change in the site of the terminals there, and that by reason of that change and by reason of the fact, as they assert it—although I do not know it is correct,—that that change has not been assented to by the company, we are not in a position to succeed in our action with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, should there be an action. I do not read clause 7 to the effect, that the direction of the road, and the location of the shops, and the like of that, are subjects upon which we must get the consent of the company, even though that consent, in this instance, may have been refused. On that point I would be glad to hear from the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) or any lawyer, or anybody else. It seems to be the interpretation of hon. gentlemen opposite, that in everything connected with this railroad, in the location of the line, in the location of the terminals, in the character of the curves, in the character of the grades, and everything else, we were completely in the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Well, unfortunately, in some degree, we are in their hands, and if, as the leader of the Opposition says to-night, we are delivered into the hands and at the mercy of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, he is the deliverer, and he is the man who put us in that position in 1903. He is the man who committed the keys of the treasury of Canada into their hands, and enabled them to say what money we should spend, enabled them to say what the cost should be, enabled them to say that we are to spend a million dollars, if necessary, to get over a mere fanciful difficulty. He is the deliverer of the keys, and he is the man also who, while he delivered us in that degree at least, into the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, failed to insert in his agreement any security that would enable us to enforce judgment against that company to take over the road, if we got judgment. There is no adequate means of enforcement, I repeat again. That is not a criticism of the drafting of the contract; that is not a reflection on the ability of the men, as lawyers, who drafted it, but it is a reflection on the Government, who gave the instructions at the time as to what should be contained in that agreement. A lawyer is not to blame because he does not insert security, when he is not instructed to insert it by his clients, and the clients of Mr. Shepley and Mr. Gormully were the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and his colleagues. And, there is no security there, and even though we got a judgment where would we be to enforce it? That is the criticism of the contract I made the other night, and that is the criticism I repeat to-night.

There are other wounds; there are other defects in this contract, as the right hon. gentleman will not deny. The right hon. gentleman knows that already because of the fact that the meaning which he says was intended was not clearly stated in the contract, we have had to pay $12,000,000 of a penalty. I do not know whether that is testimony to the legal attainments of the

men who drew the agreement, or if it is not better testimony to the skill of hon. gentlemen opposite to cover what they really intended to be the ultimate effect of the contract.

But these are not the only wounds. The right hon. gentleman no sooner made the contract than he proceeded year after year to subtract from its effect and to alter it several times to the advantage of the company and against the advantage of the country. There might have been security if we could hold the Grand Trunk Railway Company, but can we hold the Grand Trunk Railway Company; have we recourse against the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the event of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company refusing to take over the line? We did have $5,000,000 in cash as security that they would complete the western section, and that they would equip the whole after they took it over, but we have not that security now. That is a wound inflicted by the right hon. gentleman himself. The right hon. gentleman allowed the company to change the $5,000,000 in cash into substituted securities, and I scarcely think he would value these securities to-day or take them at anything like $5,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What are these securities?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not a list of the securities, but I am confident of one thing, and that is that they are not worth $5,000,000 in cash.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What are they?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand they are bonds of some American railways and some other securities, and I understand they are not worth $5,000,000, and that is a wound inflicted by the right hon. gentleman himself. More than that, there was a time when the Grand Trunk Railway Company were themselves compelled to take $25,000,000 of the stock of that company, and by reason of that clause the Minister of Finance at that time stood in his place in the House and said that the Government of the day had seen to it that the Grand Trunk be not partners only, but that they be of it and in it and form the whole thing. They may have formed the whole thing in one sense, but about two years after the hon. gentleman came along and declared, that inasmuch as they had advanced $5,000,000—the security the hon. gentleman has referred to—to the Grand Trunk Pacific, they should get their $5,000,000 of paid-up stock without paying another dollar. And, consequently, we are in the position we are in to-day, where we may have lost whatever advantage we otherwise would have secured from the backing of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

The resolution before the Chair does not involve these questions. They have been raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. When they are raised, we are ready to answer them. The question before the Chair is simply this: Should we not, now that we are faced with at least the possibility of being compelled to operate this road for some length of time, be in a position to take over the line from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William in a manner and at a consideration that will be fair and reasonable and of advantage to the country? The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham): says: You should not on any account acquire the line. If we cannot make an agreement to lease, we may be compelled to acquire it; but it is quite plain that if we can make a fair agreement to lease the line, that is the course we should pursue. My hon. friend says: You may be compelled to acquire the line, and if you are compelled to do so, you are going to be in an awkward position later on, because you will be owner of a vital part of the Transcontinental when the Grand Trunk are ready to take over the line and to operate it. It will be awkward, but it will not be so awkward for us as for the Grand Trunk. It will put us in the position where we shall have the upper hand, and I do not think that will be a misfortune. We do not want to take any advantage of the company; we want to make a fair and reasonable bargain with them to operate the line in the event of our being able to do so; but if we cannot do that, then we should be in a position to expropriate the work or a leasehold interest therein in order that we can operate the rest of the line to advantage. The alternative painted as so disastrous by my hon. friend the member for South Renfrew would only put us in the position of having, if anything, the upper hand when later we come to negotiate with the company the leasing of the whole line and of taking over our interest in the Lake Superior branch as part of the system of the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. gentleman has missed one point that I tried to make, whether I made it or not. This resolution gives the Government power to expropriate

not only the Grand Trunk Pacific property, but any other property. I had special reference in my remarks to that other property that might be left on the hands of the Government without any use for it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was going to refer to that in my next sentence. It is, I believe, a fact that the terminals at Fort William are owned by the Grand Trunk Pacific Terminals Company. I may be wrong in that, but I am informed that that is the fact. The elevators, if they are not owned by the Terminals Company, are owned by some other company; but the Government is under no obligation by virtue of this resolution to take an interest, lease, hold or otherwise, in any property that it does not believe is essential to the proper management and operation of that branch and of the whole line. We do not require to take it; but is it not wise that we be in a position that we shall not have simply the bare line of railway from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William, but that we shall be able to get the terminals which the company consider necessary for the operation of the line? They are in the same position and the arguments as to them are analogous to and just as forcible as the arguments referring to the line itself. Our desire certainly is to get the accommodation works and terminals such as may be necessary for the operation of the branch in connection with the whole Transcontinental system, and this resolution gives us power to do that and no more. If we are not able by a friendly arrangement to lease those to advantage, then we want to have the weapon whereby we are not reduced to the one alternative alone, but whereby we shall have another recourse that will leave us in a position to make a bargain on the one basis or the other that will be fair and just and of advantage to the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend the Solicitor General has frequently done to-night what he has so often done in this House in the past, that is, endeavoured very unfairly to throw upon the late Government the responsibility for the disadvantage to Canada which would ensue if the Grand Trunk Pacific did not operate the eastern branch of the National Transcontinental. My hon. friend says that one evidence of that responsibility is found in the fact that the late Government has not provided any machinery by which the company can be compelled to enter upon the operation of the eastern division. When the late Government was making an arrangement for the construction of the Transcontinental line, it took certain obligations from the Grand Trunk and had in view, what I think both companies have kept in view also, that is, that the new line should form a part of the Grand Trunk system. My hon. friend now admits that security was taken to the extent of $5,000,000 for the operation of the whole line and also for the equipment of the eastern division; but he says: The Government released that $5,000,000 and took other securities. When I asked him what those securities were—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that $5,000,000 was security for operation. Unfortunately it is not for that purpose. It is security for the equipment of the line.

Mr. PUGSLEY: $5,000,000 are to be provided for the equipment of the eastern division with rolling stock.

My hon. friend threw out the imputation that the late Government had released that money and had got something of very little value in return. I, not having a personal knowledge of what the securities were and presuming that my hon. friend, before he made that statement to the House, would have informed himself of what those securities were and what their value was, thought it proper to ask him what they were and what their value was. So far from my hon. friend being able to prove that they are of little value, all he has been able to say is that they are not worth $5,000,000. If they are first mortgage bonds of American railroads, paying their interest, it is not unlikely that they will be worth $5,000,000 in value. Their market value might be over $5,000,000. My hon. friend would have done himself more credit if he had informed himself of the facts before suggesting that the late Government had done an injustice to the country in connection with that security.

My hon. friend says there is no means of compelling the company to enter upon the operation of the eastern division. Unquestionably there would be if the Government had carried out its part of the bargain; but where two parties make a bargain, one of the parties cannot enforce it against the other unless he himself has carried out his part of it. That is admitted law. Any law student knows that after he has been three months in a law office. A difficulty about this case is—and no one knows better than my hon. friend—that the Government since

it came into power has deliberately and continually violated this contract, and therefore it finds itself to-day not in a position to compel the company to carry out its part of the bargain. If the Government had carried out its part of the bargain and this lease was presented to the Grand Trunk Pacific for execution and that company refused to execute that lease, any court in this country having proper territorial jurisdiction could be applied to for a mandatory injunction, which it would readily issue against the company, compelling it to enter upon the operation of the road, and in that respect to carry out the agreement which it had made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of what value would that be?

Mr. PUGSLEY: This Government is in no position to do that, because it has violated the contract so far as it is concerned. My hon. friend says: Oh, that cannot be so, because Mr. Gordon Grant, the chief engineer, has said that the road is completed. Mr. Gordon Grant has done nothing of the kind. My hon. friend, in his letter of March 6, is careful to let Mr. Gordon Grant know that if he can give a certificate which in some measure would satisfy, not the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company but the people of this country, that if the company did not enter upon the operation of the road they would be in fault and so in some way throw blame and responsibility upon the late Government, the Government would be much obliged to him for such a certificate. See how ingeniously my hon. friend writes:

I have always understood, both from yourself and from the commission—

Impressing upon Mr. Grant what he had given him to understand.

—that although there are such portions that are still under construction—

In other words: Although the road is not completed—because, of course, a road that is under construction cannot be said to be completed.

—the same are not essential for the immediate operation of the entire line, and consequently that it would not be reasonable to wait for their completion until the said section 20 was acted upon. Would you be good enough, therefore, to state that in your opinion the eastern division was, on 31st December, 1914, completed, so far as essential for the efficient operation of the entire line at that time and now?

Not that you will state that the road is completed according to the specifications; not that you will state that the contract has been fulfilled by the Government by carrying out the agreement they made; but: that at the present time, having in view the possible traffic, the road can be efficiently operated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is assuming that I did not ask Mr. Grant to state that the road was completed within the meaning of the contract, but that it was completed ready for operation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Quite so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What becomes of the hon. gentleman's argument when he learns that in the letter which Mr. Grant wrote in reply to me, he did state that the road was completed and ready for operation within the meaning and intent of section 20 of the agreement? That must have been more or less voluntary, was it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Solicitor General must not forget that he had conveyed it to Mr. Grant in the strongest way possible that the Government would be delighted to have from him some certificate which would show that the road was ready for efficient operation. But Mr. Grant knew, and my hon. friend knew, and so did the Government, that the road was not completed according to the specifications, and the contract had not been carried out.

My hon. friend says that Mr. Grant had given a certificate before that. But, as the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has said, the copy of that letter given to him does not profess to be signed by Mr. Grant. I have a copy, and there is no signature. Let us see what he says as to justification for his signing that certificate. I would direct your attention and that of the committee to the letter of February 2 to Mr. Woods:

9 p.m.

February 2, 1915.

A. H. Woods, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, or Acting Engineer,
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway,
Winnipeg. Main.

Dear sir,—Under section 7, of the schedule of the National Transcontinental Railway Act, 1903—

Which is the section my hon. friend from South Renfrew referred to.

—it was stipulated that the work to be done on the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the Government and the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Now, mark well what follows:

The Government is of the opinion that this provision has been complied with in every way,

but to put the matter of acceptance into desirable form, I enclose herewith formal acceptance which I have executed as chief engineer for the Government, and I would ask you to kindly sign as chief engineer, or acting chief engineer, for the company.

The enclosure is in duplicate, and you are at liberty to retain one of the copies for your company.

Yours truly,

Gordon Grant,
Chief Engineer.

Here you have the extraordinary fact that Mr. Grant excuses himself for this by saying that "the Government is of the opinion" that the contract has been complied with. He does not put it forward, as he dare not, as an engineer, put it forward, that the contract has been completed. He dare not put it forward that the road has been built according to the specifications. He says the Government is of the opinion and therefore encloses a certificate to be signed. But Mr. Grant, if left to himself, I do not think for a moment, would venture to say it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that Mr. Grant would not say that, when he also says that Mr. Grant has executed a certificate to that effect?

Mr. PUGSLEY: But he gives the reason. He puts it forward that the Government is behind him, and intimates to the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific that that is the stand the Governmnent is going to take and he as an official of the Government signs it.

It does not need any one with engineering skill to determine that this contract was not complied with, that is admitted by the Government in their correspondence with the Grand Trunk Pacific. They admit that the road is not completed, but they say: We can go on and complete it in the future; but in the meantime, having in view the contract, it is not reasonable for you to ask the Government to wait, and you can well enter upon the efficient operation of the road. Now, the Solicitor General has called my attention to section 20, and says that the term there " when completed " means ready for operation. He would almost have you believe that it was so defined in section 20. But is it so defined? You must bear in mind that before section 20 we have section 7, which provides that the work is to be carried out under the joint supervision of the two engineers. They are to pass upon the work from time to time, and to see that it is according to specifications. Then when it comes to section 20 it says " when completed." Surely, that must mean when completed according to the specifications. If I engage a contractor to build a house, to be four stories high, and if he builds the house only three stories high, surely he would not be justified in saying that he had carried out the specifications because the house had been so far completed that it could be comfortably occupied. Yet that is the argument of my hon. friend. If the contractor were to say to me: Money is scarce, and I will put on the fourth story three or four years from now, when it is more convenient for me to do so; but in the meantime, as your family is small, three stories will meet your requirements; move in and you will be very comfortable.

Mr. COCHRANE: But would your architect certify that it was four stories?

Mr. PUGSLEY: According to my hon. friend, he should certify that it was completed.

Mr. COCHRANE: But would he certify?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, because what my hon. friend argues is that completion means that it shall be in such condition that it may be efficiently used. Well if it was three stories it could be efficiently and comfortably occupied. It is too absurd to argue for a single moment. Let any hon. gentleman read section 20 for himself, and I appeal now to fair-minded gentlemen on the other side of the House. Section 20 says:

When completed the said eastern division shall be leased to, and operated by, the company for the period of fifty years, at a rental, payable as follows:

Then it goes on providing for the rental. I think it is beyond question that that means when it is completed according to the specifications. No other interpretation can be put upon the words " when completed " in that section. My hon. friend says that the Government were remiss in another respect, that they had not provided as to when the road should be deemed to be completed. Have they not, sir? When they make a contract as to specifications does not the completion of the road mean when those specifications have been complied with and the road has been constructed according to the specifications? That is the completion of it. What does the minister do when he agrees to give to a company a railway subsidy of which a certain percentage is to be kept back until the road is completed? No one knows better than my hon. friend that the completion of a road according to the specifi-

cations which he had laid down would mean that the roadbed would be made, the rails and ties laid, the road ballasted, the turn-tables, telephone and telegraph lines, station houses and section houses built, all water tanks and all terminals provided according to specifications. Supposing a railway company come to the minister and say: Oh, well, now this road is completed. The minister says: It is not completed, you have not got all the water tanks you agreed to put on. You agreed to put on a 65-lb. rail and you have only got a 50-lb. rail. Supposing the company said: In view of the traffic, the few water tanks we have are quite sufficient and a 50-lb. rail is quite sufficient for the present traffic; we propose using light engines until traffic develops, and therefore, Mr. Minister, we want you to be convinced by us that the road is completed because it can be efficiently operated in view of the present traffic. Would not the minister say at once: It is not completed, I have laid down certain specifications and will not pay the balance of the subsidy until you have completed the road according to those specifiations.

Mr. COCHRANE: Would the hon. member let me know in what part of the Act it calls for the building of a shop such as the Leonard shops in Quebec?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is there in the agreement.

Mr. COCHRANE: I would like to see it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I shall read it before I am through.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What was done in this case? The late Government were exceedingly careful to appoint a good chief engineer to prepare the plans and specifications jointly with the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. It was reasonable that there should be a joint preparation of plans and specifications and joint supervision, because the Grand Trunk Pacific was to operate this line when it was completed. They were to engage upon the operation of it for fifty years and to pay a rental after seven years of 3 per cent upon the cost of it. Therefore it was reasonable that the company should have a joint supervision with the Government. That was the agreement which Parliament ratified in 1903, and which the people of this country ratified at the election of 1904. The late Government was careful to see that in all respects the terms of that contract were carried out and the specifications carefully observed; and in the construction of the road, while the late Government was in power, the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific was consulted from time to time and everything that was done was done with the approval of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The specifications, as I understand, included the workshops both at Transcona and at Quebec.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman says everything was done with the approval of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Does he mean that word in its absolute sense, including the location of the line, location of shops, location of terminals, such as the right hon. leader of the Opposition says are necessary?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have always understood that. I know that after I came into the Government we were very careful always to see that nothing was done without the approval of the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. We recognized that that was the contract, and we thought it was the duty of the commissioners of the road to see that this approval was obtained from time to time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Including the location?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Including the location. That would be my reading of it, that it would include the location, grades and curves and all the equipment of the line. It would include station-houses, terminals and workshops and everything else which would go to make a complete railway. My hon. friend makes a point of the location. I do not know whether there was any exception with respect to that, but I would think that location would be included because the plans and specifications must have to do with the location. What does section 7 provide? It provides:

> In order to insure, for the protetcion of the company as lessees of the eastern division of the said railway, the economical construction thereof in such a manner that it can be operated to the best advantage, it is hereby agreed that the specifications for the construction of the eastern division shall be submitted to, and approved of by, the company before the commencement of the work, and that the said work shall be done according to the said specifications and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the Government and the chief engineer of the company.

Therefore you have it as plain as language can be made, in an agreement which was ratified by this Parliament in 1903, that the specifications shall be approved of by the company:

—and that the said work shall be done according to the said specifications and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of a chief engineer appointed by the Government and the chief engineer of the company.

Now, Sir, in case of a dispute between the two engineers, what is to happen? My hon. friend says that the late Government did not provide for what was to happen in that case; he says that the only remedy would be an appeal to the courts. I say that the section provides in the clearest possible manner as to what shall happen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In case of a dispute over some things.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As to the completion of the work.

And, in the event of differences as to the specifications, or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the questions in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator, to be chosen in the manner provided in paragraph four of this agreement.

What is meant by the work? It is the work of construction. How could there be a difference unless it was based upon the specifications? Then, as the work went on, from time to time one engineer might say: This work is not up to the specifications. The other engineer might say: It is up to the specifications. Differing, they would have an arbitrator called in, whom they would appoint, and if they failed to agree upon an arbitrator one would be appointed by the Chief Justice of Canada. What difference is there when the work is done? The Government says: Now this road is completed according to the specifications. The chief engineer of the company says: It is not, the work is not up to the specifications. That is a dispute between them, it is a dispute as to the work because the work must be viewed in reference to the specifications which have been provided as to the mode in which this work is to be done. They differ therefore on the question whether the complete work is up to the specifications or not. The Act provides that the questions in dispute

—shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator, to be chosen in the manner provided in paragraph four of this agreement.

Let me take as an illustration the case of a house that is to be built. A man makes a contract with a contractor for the building of a house. The contractor has an architect; the owner of the house has also an architect. It is agreed that if there is any dispute between the two architects under whose joint supervision the work is to be carried on, it shall be referred to a third party. Now, would any one suggest for a single moment that that would not apply to the work when it was alleged to be completed, just as much as it would apply to the work as it was going on from day to day during the progress of construction? That is exactly the present case. There is no difference at all. The work might be one-half or two-thirds or three-quarters or nine-tenths finished. One party claims that the work is finished according to the contract and specifications. The other claims that it is not. That is a dispute as to whether the work has been done according to and up to the requirements of the specifications. That is a dispute which these parties decide is to be determined by the two engineers, and in case they cannot agree is to be arbitrated upon by the two engineers and a third party to be chosen by the Chief Justice of Canada. Surely no man who is disposed to look at the matter from a fair and reasonable standpoint would say that the Government had not exercised every possible care and provided a tribunal to meet this very case.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Owing to the fact that the Quebec bridge will not be completed until the latter part of 1917, would the hon. gentleman advise this Government not to urge upon the Grand Trunk Pacific the need of taking over the road as a completed road before that time expires?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would urge the Government to do that. And let me say to my hon. friend that there is one thing that surprises me exceedingly, and that is that this Government did not do what we were about to do before the late Government left office, and that was to arrange for the operation of the various sections of the Transcontinental as they were completed from time to time, pending the completion of the whole line and the entering into of the lease.

Mr. ARTHURS: Did the Government make any arrangement to that effect?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Two sessions ago I called the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that before the late Government left office a conference was held between a subcommittee of the Council, consisting of the then Prime Minister, the then Finance Minister, the then Minister of Railways, myself, and Mr. Hays, the president of the

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Mr. Hays was then desirous of taking over the sections of the line as they were completed from time to time. At that time the road from Moncton to Edmundston was pretty nearly completed. Mr. Hays' proposition was this. He said that if the Government would let the Grand Trunk Pacific take possession of such sections they would put on their rolling stock and operate the line to the best possible advantage, they would keep an account as between the earnings and the expenses, they would have those accounts audited from time to time by a Government auditor, and if any profit was made they would put that into the treasury or give the Government credit for it, and if there was any loss the Government should pay that loss but it should be added to capital account to form a part of the cost of the Transcontinental railway on which the Grand Trunk Pacific would pay interest. I thought, as representing one of the Maritime Provinces—the province of New Brunswick, through the centre of which the Transcontinental passes—that it would be very desirable to make that arrangement, because the result would be that as the sections were completed the Grand Trunk Pacific would get the road in active operation and begin to stimulate industries along the line because they would all inure to the benefit of the company. That was the arrangement which the president of the Grand Trunk Pacific proposed to make. We went out of office before that section of the road was completed, and two years ago I asked the Minister of Railways if he had taken up with the Grand Trunk Pacific the question of making an arrangement such as that which Mr. Hays offered to make to our Government. He said not. I then asked him if he would approach the Grand Trunk Pacific and see whether they were still willing to make that arrangement. He promised to do so. That was two years ago, and my. hon. friend has not yet acquainted this House with the results of his efforts in that direction. I asked if there was any correspondence on the subject, but none has been brought down; and in the correspondence which has been brought down to-night there is a marked absence on the part of the Minister of Railways of evidence of any effort to induce the Grand Trunk Pacific to take up the operation of sections of the line upon those terms. Let me ask if it will not be to the interest of the Government to make that arrangement if the Grand Trunk Pacific is still willing to make it, and let me say to my hon. friend that when I told him of the arrangement which Mr. Hays was willing to make for the operation of the various sections of the line, he promised to take this matter up; and I think it is due to the House, if he has made that effort, to state what the result of it is, and to bring down any correspondence which he has bearing on the subject.

What does it propose to do? Without making any effort, so far as appears from the correspondence, to get the railway company to carry out the arrangement they were willing to carry out when the late Government was in office, this Government proposes itself to engage in the operation of the railway from Moncton to Winnipeg. What does that mean? It means that this Government has got to put this country to an expense of many millions of dollars to provide rolling stock, if they are going to give efficient operation, and to-night in almost the dying days of this session and after the Prime Minister had told my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition that no new legislation of a contentious character would be brought down, this Government brings down a resolution which, from the standpoint of the interest of this country and more especially of the interests of eastern Canada, is of a most contentious character. They bring down a resolution which if adopted would authorize them to spend not only millions of dollars in rolling stock without coming to this Parliament for an appropriation, but to spend at least $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 in acquiring the branch line of 180 miles from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William, and in acquiring the branch line of 180 miles from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William, and a great many millions of dollars in acquiring the terminals of the Grand Trunk Pacific; and I am sure the terminals could not be purchased through the Exchequer Court for $30,000,000, and I doubt whether they could be purchased for less than $40,000,000. And yet they come down in the last days of the session and ask Parliament to vest them with authority to incur this enormous outlay involved in the resolution for which they are asking the assent of the House. Would it not be a thousand times better for this Government to make an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Pacific, who are to operate this line for

the future and possibly for all time to come, that they should engage in the operation of the line pending the completion of it and pending the entering into of a formal lease? The accounts should be kept under Government supervision, and if there was any deficiency it should be charged up to capital account on which the company would pay interest. That is the reasonable thing to do. That would not involve this country in any large expenditure. It would involve it, in case there should be any loss, only in the difference between revenue and cost of operating.

And if that were done we would have our hopes realized that the Grand Trunk Pacific would operate this Transcontinental railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. So far as we in the Maritime Provinces are concerned, we have been looking forward with hope to the day when we would see the trains of the Transcontinental railway entering into the cities of the lower provinces, bearing their passengers and freight from the Pacific coast and from the territories and provinces of the West. But we are met to-night with a resolution which, if it carries, and if the Government act upon it, will in all probability destroy forever the hopes that we have had that the Grand Trunk Pacific is going to operate this eastern division as a part of the great transcontinental railway system.

What is back of this resolution? Surely, if it is only intended to temporarily operate the main line between Moncton and Winnipeg, it is not necessary to spend $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 in acquiring this branch from the main line to Fort William and the terminals at Fort William. If the Government operates the main line it can make arrangements with the Grand Trunk Pacific, no doubt, for joint running rights between Winnipeg and Superior Junction, and an exchange of traffic down to the terminals at Fort William. There will be no difficulty about that. Would there be any more difficulty about that than there would be when the Government trains would reach Winnipeg? They would have no through service to the prairies of the West, from which the great traffic is to be drawn. They would have to secure an exchange of traffic with the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific at Winnipeg. Where is the objection to their doing what other railway companies, including the Government railway, are doing to-day—exchanging traffic upon fair and reasonable terms? But, while coming here to-night with the suggestion that all they want is to make a temporary arrangement pending the completion of the line, they are asking Parliament for enormous powers. If it were not so startling a proposition to even suggest it, I would say that this is all in line with the course which this Government entered upon when they came into office of degrading this Transcontinental railway, refusing to consult with the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, refusing to take his advice, abandoning the workshops at Quebec, located on land which already had been bought and which was being laid out under the joint supervision and approval of the chief engineers of the Government and the company respectively, going nine miles away and arranging for the erection of workshops upon a different site altogether, the location of which, so far as I know, never was approved by the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. COCHRANE: I have the word of the president of the road that he approved of everything that was done.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the hon. gentleman produce that?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have the word of the president, I say.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where is that? In an important matter of this kind that should be produced.

Mr. COCHRANE: I will back up his word and I will prove that I have it. The word of the president is good and will stand anywhere.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The only men under this contract who can speak as to the work of building this road are the chief engineer appointed by the Government and the chief engineer appointed by the company.

Mr. COCHRANE: I will take the word of the president for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think that when such an important change as that is made, if it has been approved by the chief engineer, we ought to have the certificate, or a memorandum, of that official. It has not been furnished to this Parliament and, in so far as the alterations in the grades and curves are concerned, we had at last session of Parliament before us letters from the officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific distinctly refusing to accept the changes that this Government had made in respect to the building of the road. As far as I know there has never been any withdrawal of the objections that the company has made.

As I have said, if the Government had had in view the bringing about of the time when the company would refuse to enter upon the operation of this road, if they had had that in their minds, if that was the subject closest to their hearts so that they believed that they would be able to say to the people of the country: look what a position the late Government has brought this country into; they have constructed this road and the company of their own creation has refused to operate it—if that had been their purpose, or if they had been actuated by the other purpose of extending the Intercolonial railway and if they had deliberately set about to accomplish that purpose and to prevent the Grand Trunk Pacific from engaging in the operation of this road, they could not have taken a surer course to accomplish that than by degrading the road as they did, altering the grades and putting in these momentum grades, altering the curves, altering the position of the terminals at Quebec and the location of the station and the workshops.

I do not believe that to be in the interest of the country. I quite agree that it would be desirable to have an extension of the Intercolonial westward but let it be done by arranging for running rights over the Grand Trunk Pacific, as provided for in the contract under terms to be agreed upon, and if they cannot be agreed upon to be fixed by the Governor in Council. I quite approve of that being done if terms can be arranged. But to take steps which may lead to the shutting out of the Grand Trunk Pacific from the operation of the eastern section of the road, which seems to be contemplated by the Government in view of the resolution, would be a disastrous step to take in so far as the interests of the country are concerned. It must be borne in mind that the whole traffic, or rather the greater portion of the traffic of the people's road east of Winnipeg, must be derived from our rich prairie provinces and from the Pacific coast. Suppose this Government were to expropriate the line on the Grand Trunk Pacific from Superior Junction down to Fort William and use the Transcontinental for their eastern operations, what would be the result? The Grand Trunk Pacific would still have their line running from Winnipeg to the prairies of the West and on to the Pacific ocean. It is not an insuperable proposition for them to get from Winnipeg to Chicago and when they got to Chicago they would be in connection with the Grand Trunk railway system and they would take the traffic of the West over their American line and down to American ports. They would in that way accomplish the very thing which the late Government wished to prevent when they insisted upon the operation of the eastern division right down to the ports of the Maritime Provinces by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

The matter, to my mind, is one of a most serious character. I wonder that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) has consented to this resolution. Let me tell him that the people of the city which he is sent here to represent are demanding that the trains of the Grand Trunk Pacific shall be run as soon as possible into the city of St. John and in the other cities of the Maritime Provinces. They would be astonished to learn that he has been a party to a proposition which looks to me, if it looks like anything at all, as a proposal to stop the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific at Winnipeg and leave it to seek other channels which would naturally be through American territory and through American ports. For these reasons I am entirely opposed to the resolution which has been submitted by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals.

A word with reference to a matter of lesser importance. There has been continually an effort made to magnify the cost of this Transcontinental railway. I asked if in this statement which the Government have sent to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company the interest had not been compounded, and the Solicitor-General said, no. I regret that I am compelled to differ from him, because in the very papers which have been submitted, we find, that up to the 31st December, 1914, the total cost is $172,152,943, and the interest is all included, some $19,000,000, and it is all compounded.

Mr. COCHRANE: If the hon. gentleman will look at clause 15 of the Act, he will find that it says:

> The interest upon such outlay in each year shall be capitalized at the end of such year and interest charged thereon at three per cent per annum until the completion of the work and until the lessees enter into possession on the terms of the said lease.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Quite right, and it means that the interest during that year shall be added to the cost and then that total amount shall bear interest, but not compound interest.

Mr. COCHRANE: The calculation is worked out according to the Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The statement which is attached to the correspondence shows clearly in detail that the interest has been compounded.

Mr. LALOR: Did you ever understand it in any other way?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understood it absolutely the other way, and any man who reads it, with any common sense, will understand it as I understand it. Let me read it again:

The interest upon said outlay in each year—

That is, the outlay in each year:

—shall be capitalized at the end of such year and interest charged thereon at three per cent until the completion of the work.

That does not mean compound interest, and the Solicitor General realized that was so because he told me that only simple interest and not compound interest had been charged. I find in a further statement which the minister was good enough to send over to this side of the House, that the very heading of the statement shows the interest was compounded, because it says:

Statement showing expenditures on the National Transcontinental railway, eastern division, to 31st December, 1914, and compound interest at three per cent per annum.

It is only a matter of a few million dollars in the total, but still it is an extraordinary thing that in the face of the provision in the statute, this statement should be sent to the company as the amount upon which they would be called to pay interest.

It does seem to me that the Government ought to make this temporary arrangement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and I say to the Minister of Railways that from what Mr. Hays told me and told the sub-Committee of Council of the desire of the company, and from what Mr. Chamberlain has told me since this Government came into office, I believe that if that company were approached in a proper spirit—and not in the spirit which is shown in this correspondence, compelling them to accept as completed a road which the Government knows is not completed according to the specifications, compelling them to begin at a specified time to pay interest, which they are not bound, under the law, to begin to pay until a certain period after the road is completed—if instead of acting in this spirit against this company the Government were to approach them and endeavour to have them enter into this agreement, which the president of the company expressed his willingness to enter into when the late Government was in power, there would not be the slightest difficulty in bringing that arrangement about, and it is an arrangement which would be eminently in the interests of the people of the country.

The Solicitor General spoke about the Quebec bridge. The late Government had from the company a declaration in writing that they would not regard the Quebec bridge as an essential factor in connection with the construction and completion of the Transcontinental.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is not in the Act and there is no correspondence with reference to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I know they agreed to it, and I think there is correspondence on the subject.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There was.

Mr. COCHRANE: It must have been taken away.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am certain that any objection, so far as that was concerned, was positively waived by the company, and in the correspondence which has been brought down there is no intimation, upon the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, that they rely upon the non-completion of the Quebec bridge. If the Government wants the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to enter into the operation of this line, why do they not approach them and ask them if they are willing to carry out the agreement they offered to carry out when the late Government was in power?

Mr. COCHRANE: We have asked them that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the hon. gentleman produce the correspondence on that subject?

Mr. COCHRANE: I think there is a letter there.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That letter does not say a word about it. What the minister is asking the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to do is to enter into a lease before the road is completed, and he is taking the ground that they are bound to enter into that lease and bound to begin paying rental within the seven years of entering into the lease. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company say: We will not do that, we are not bound to do that because the road is not completed according to the specifica-

tions. Has the minister requested the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to engage in the operation of the road pending its completion, and pending their entering into a formal lease? I told him two years ago, and he seemed impressed with it, and he told me he would act upon it, of the terms on which the company were willing to engage in the active operation of the road. It must be borne in mind also, and this is another reason why we should not pass the resolution to-night, that by section 3 of the supplementary agreement of date the 2nd February, 1904, this Parliament provided that pending the completion of the whole line, arrangements might be made between the Government and the company for the operation of various sections. That clause of the supplementary agreement says:

> Pending the completion of the eastern division by the Government, the company shall be entitled to lease from the commissioners, to be appointed under the said Act, and to operate such portions of the said eastern division, as may from time to time be completed, but upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the company and the said commissioners which terms are not to be more onerous than those of the lease of the whole division by the said contract provided for.

Eleven years ago, this Parliament recognizing the importance of having the Grand Trunk Pacific Company enter as quickly as possible upon the operation of the different sections of this road, provided for the operation by the Grand Trunk Pacific of the completed sections from time to time.

Notwithstanding, as I have said, that the late Government had a definite proposition from the Grand Trunk Pacific to carry out their arrangement as provided in the statute of 1904, as far as this Parliament has been informed, the Government has never taken the slightest step to have that arrangement carried out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What section?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Section 3 of the agreement of the 18th of February, 1904, which will be found on page 193 of the statutes of 1904.

Surely some regard ought to be had to what has been the view of this Parliament and of the country in the past. When we find that that view was that the company and the Government should endeavour to come to terms as to the operation of the different sections from time to time, surely the Government is not treating this Parliament or the people of this country rightly.

when, instead of endeavouring to make a fair and reasonable arrangement pending the completion of the whole line of railway under the specifications and pending the arrival of the time when the company will be obliged to enter into a lease under which, after a definite period, they will begin to pay rent, the Government acts here to-night as if it were looking to the company not leasing the line and as if it contemplated taking over the whole system east of Winnipeg and the Grand Trunk Pacific branch and all the terminals at Fort William, which action will involve this country in an expenditure which I do not think will be counted at one dollar less than from $30,000,000 to $40,000,000. That is an enormous expenditure in which to involve the country when there is no necessity whatever for it, when if the company were approached in a proper manner, they would enter into a fair and equitable arrangement to carry out the aspirations of our people to have one company operating the entire system from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we were not so accustomed in this House to the alarmful speeches of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), we might perceive a possible revolution in Canada if this fearful resolution should carry; but we are accustomed to his seeing in every proposal of the Government something dreadful, some awful ghost behind the door, some tremendous debt on the part of Canada, and, last of all and most fearful and most to be dreaded of all, a possible injury to the port of St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And Halifax too.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), who was Minister of Railways and a colleague of the hon. member for St. John, openly and frankly stated at the commencement of the discussion that it was in the interest of the people of Canada that provision should be made now for the operation of this line in the event of the company not taking it over. The hon. member for South Renfrew went further than that. He stated that in his judgment it would be a blessing for the people of Canada and nothing to be dreaded if we took over the Transcontinental line permanently and operated it. Yet the very fact that we take power to operate it in the only way in which it can be operated, that is, by securing the line from Fort William to Lake Superior Junction in some way or other, makes the hon. member for St. John

afraid that we are going to turn trade by way of Chicago and utterly demoralize the port of St. John. He also criticises us because we have not secured in any form the approval of the engineer of the road. I thought, in my humble judgment, that I had shown that we had the certificate of the engineer in the most emphatic and definite form in which a certificate could be given. If the hon. member for St. John has any clearer or more definite form, I do not think I am going beyond the mark when I say that I will undertake to have it signed by the engineer of the road, because I know the emphatic opinion of that engineer.

The hon. member argues at great length that we have not the consent of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the location of certain lines in Winnipeg; that we have not their consent to certain alterations of the grade, which he says have been made, and he refuses to take the word of the minister that the company are finding no fault on that score at all, so anxious is he, if he can, to build up a case for the Grand Trunk Pacific to justify them in refusing to carry out their part of the agreement. While he is on his feet, he asserts that the Grand Trunk Pacific in all this correspondence have not as yet said that the line is not completed; that they have not found fault with anything that is not completed. If they have not said it, they are getting lots of opportunities to say it; they are getting lots of foundation for doing so out of the mouth of the hon. member for St. John. He says: You have to get their consent.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member says that I stated that it did not appear that the Grand Trunk Pacific contended that the road was not completed.

Mr. MEIGHEN : That it did not appear in the correspondence.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No. I stated that not only did the Grand Trunk Pacific say that the road was not completed, but the correspondence said it was not completed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend said that the Grand Trunk Pacific said that the road was not completed, and he said the opposite as well. He takes both sides, just whichever side suits the argument he has in hand. He complains of the Government for not following the advice of the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. He complains of us for not following the advice of a company that must be adverse to us, if we meet any adversity at all. At the same time he is criticising us because we are following the advice of our own chief engineer, in whom he says he has the utmost confidence himself. The Government of which my hon. friend was a member selected an engineer in whom it had confidence. Now he comes to us and says: You are not justified in following the advice of that engineer as to the completion of the road; you ought to take my opinion, and if you are not satisfied with that, you ought to take the opinion of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I said: If there is a dispute, leave it to arbitration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there is a dispute, leave it to arbitration as to whether or not the road is completed. I tried to get the opinion of the hon. member for St. John and he gave it to me; but he did not fortify it by any extended argument. He indulged in a few brief superlatives on the point, and that was all. Section 7 in no way contemplated arbitration as a method of determining when the road was completed. That section gave the right to the Grand Trunk Pacific to say as to the method employed and set out in the specifications and as to the method and manner of the fulfilment of those specifications. That was the view that appealed to me at the time. Whether I am right or not has never been decided by any one. That is what appealed to me, and that does not include and cannot be stretched to include the question of the completion of the road. Does the hon. member argue that the Grand Trunk Pacific has a right to say what shall be built and what not, and that if we cannot agree we must go to arbitration?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Undoubtedly the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific has a voice jointly with the chief engineer of the Government as to whether the road is built or completed according to specifications. If they differ, then it is provided that the question whether the road is completed according to specifications or not shall be left to them and a third arbitrator.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly, says the hon. member for St. John, as regards the question of what the Government shall build, not as to the character of the road and how it fills the specifications, but the extent of it: whether or not it shall include

shops here or shops there, whether or not it shall include terminals, whether or not it shall include a branch line into the city of Quebec, the Government has committed the country to the position that the Grand Trunk Pacific have just as much say as has the Government. I venture, on the other hand, not to take such a disparaging view of the work of the late Government as that. I venture to take the view that the late Government had committed into the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific a say and a determining say as to the character of the construction and of the specifications, but had not committed to them any determining say as to the location or extent of the work. Much less had they committed to them the question as to the completion. The hon. member is very emphatic, as he always is—it seems to be no effort for him to give a legal opinion antagonistic to the opinion of the Government; he is not hampered by anything, even by his own previous opinion. He said that the late Government always acquiesced in that view and always submitted to the Grand Trunk Pacific all these questions including location, and they went ahead with nothing without the consent of the company. Does he know whereof he speaks? I undertake to quote to him the opinion of the Minister of Justice of the Government to which he belonged directly conflicting with the opinion he announces to-night and directly supporting the view I have advanced, that no such powers were committed to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and, in effect, that the opinion expressed by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition that we are powerless now by virtue of the fact that we have not their consent—as he alleges—to the change in location of the terminal at Quebec, we are now in the hands and at the mercy of the Grand Trunk Pacific, is quite a mistaken opinion. The Minister of Justice of that day was confronted with this question, so was the deputy minister, so were the law advisors of the commission; and they with one accord gave the opinion that as to this matter of location of the work the Grand Trunk Pacific Company had no say at all. Does he disagree with that? Will he venture to deny it? I will read the opinion of the Minister of Justice of that day. It is dated 24th of January, 1906, and it is written to the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), then leader of the Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the hon. gentleman say that I was then in the Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member suggests that had he been a member of the Government his opinion would have been different.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That may be very witty on the part of the hon. gentleman—

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is very true.

Mr. PUGSLEY: —but what the Solicitor General said was that the Government of which I was a member took a different view. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that I was not a member of the Government until a year after.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the hon. member said that his Government always took the view that this was a matter for co-operation and within the power of the Grand Trunk Pacific to concur in, and had always acted upon that view. And the leader of the Opposition argues to-night that we must get their consent to any change whatever in location—

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: I did not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of location of terminals.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: I say you must adhere to the specifications for the building of the road.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is, we can change no location—

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: I did not say location. I said that the specifications for the buiding of this road had been agreed upon by the engineers of the Government and of the company, and you cannot change it without the consent of the company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is, we cannot change the location if the location is set out in the specification.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: I did not speak of the location.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I misunderstood the right hon. gentleman.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: The hon. gentleman cannot say I mentioned the location of the road. I said that when the plans and specifications for the building of the road the building of shops and so on, had been agreed to by the officers of the company and the Government, you cannot change it without consent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the right hon. gentleman to argue that we had changed the location of the terminals at Quebec, and I understood him to argue just as strongly that the terminals at Quebec were part of the road.

10 p.m.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Consequently he argues that we have changed the location of the road.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: No, that is too thin.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will repeat what the hon. gentleman says is " too thin," and ask him in what he finds fault with it. He argues that we have changed the location of the terminal; he argues that the terminals are part of the road and you have to build them before you build the road, consequently, he argues, we have changed the location of the road itself.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: No; what I said is, that the shops and the station are part of the road—you cannot run the road without shops and stations—and the shops at Quebec, being part of the road, and having been approved by the engineers of the Government and the company, you cannot change them without the consent of the company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Change them in what respect?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You cannot move them five or ten miles.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, that is location.

Mr. GRAHAM: And the specifications have been changed as well—

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is as to character; and that has been consented to.

Mr. GRAHAM: Where has it been consented to?

Mr. MEIGHEN: At Quebec.

Mr. GRAHAM: I asked for the correspondence, and I went through it very carefully. It showed that a conversation had been held with the Minister of Railways by Mr. Chamberlin, if I remember well; that conversation was referred to, but when the Government attempted to make that out to be a consent, as I remember the correspondence, the solicitors of the Grand Trunk Pacific immediately objected and said they did not give consent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may have been given since.

Mr. COCHRANE: You will take Mr. Chamberlin's word, I suppose?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Parliament of Canada can only know what takes place by the correspondence and returns given to it. We asked the Government to give us the negotiations and correspondence, and surely agreements of this kind would not be taken verbally when so much depends upon them. That correspondence does not show one word as to the acceptance of either a change in the specifications or location, but it states positively that the consent was not given.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may not have been given at the time, but it may have been given since.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Where is it?

Mr. GRAHAM: Where is it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Notice the eagerness of hon. gentlemen opposite to get off the point of the location—both crying at once. I am not arguing but that if the specifications, in so far as they cover the method of construction, are agreed to they must be lived up to, unless they are departed from by mutual consent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not arguing differently from that, but I am arguing that the matter of location is within the power of the Government, at all events in opinion of the gentleman who was the Minister of Justice under the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That opinion completely destroys the position he took here to-night.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Let us hear it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The right hon. gentleman wants me to read the opinion. He may find " location " in it though he dreads it so much. This is the opinion:

Referring to Mr. Parent's letter to you of 22nd instant, enclosing copy of a letter to him of 20th instant, from Mr. Morse, the vice-president of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, in which Mr. Morse states that under section 7 of the agreement between the Government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company of the 29th July, 1903, the company claim the absolute unequivocal right to pass upon the location of the eastern division before it is adopted, I desire to say that I have considered

attentively the claim so made, and conferred upon the subject with the Deputy Minister of Justice, and we agree in the following conclusions:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The right hon. gentleman has not heard the conclusions yet:

1. Section 5 of this agreement gives the Government the uncontrolled discretion to determine the location of the eastern division.
2. This discretion is not limited or affected by clause 7.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the clause hon. gentlemen opposite rely upon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear. If that is not limited or affected by clause 7, what does limit or affect it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We can locate the road, and in that location the company has nothing to say, according to that opinion. Does the hon. member pretend that the opinion of the late Minister of Justice says that when the road has been located we can change it again without the consent of the company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Wherein are we restrained?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: By common sense. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that when we had located the road and placed it at a certain point, after we had spent millions upon it, it was open to the Government to change it and put it ten or fifty miles to one side? That is perfectly absurd. We located the road. According to the Minister of Justice we had the right to locate the road, and we did, and after the road had been located we laid down the specifications. The specifications included the stations and workshops. Those specifications we submitted to the company and their engineers and they were approved by both engineers. I say that when this was done they could not be changed without the consent of the company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It would be monstrous to pretend anything else.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to the location of shops, the engineers had nothing to say. Even if the hon. gentleman got their approval of the location of the shops and made a bargain he did not need to do so, according to the opinion of his Minister of Justice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It would be monstrous to pretend that on a road to be leased to a company, upon which they would have to pay a rental, when we had to have their consent as to rails, ties, culverts and everything of that kind, they would have nothing to say as to the location and character of the shops and the location of stations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would ask my right hon. friend not to mix in the character with the location. The author of that monstrous provision is his own Minister of Justice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not at all; nothing of the kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 5 of this agreement gives the Government the uncontrolled discretion to determine the location of the eastern division.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear; to put it here or to put it there

Mr. MEIGHEN: To put it here or to put it there, and it does not require the consent of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Is that not right?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, I submit it to the fair judgment of anybody, that when we had located the road at this point my hon. friend cannot pretend that after we had built it we could say to the Grand Trunk Pacific: We discard all that; we are going to locate another road apart from this.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It might be monstrous when we had built the road to change, but that would be a matter of business judgment. As to the matter of law, our right to locate the road begins at the commencement and ends with the completion of the road.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend is coming all the time to the location of the road. The point is, could you change the character of the road when it had been located?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The character of the road is not under discussion at all; that is only what my right hon. friend wants to get under discussion as soon as possible. It is the location that is under discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That location is determined on without reference to the com-

pany; there is no need of reference to them; and if my hon. friend got their consent and made them a party to the contract, he did not have to do so. It is located without reference to them, and, within the discretion of the Government, they could change that location at their will.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not at all. I dispute that point altogether. There is nothing in the letter of the Minister of Justice to justify that interpretation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would like the right hon. gentleman to tell me when their discretion ceases. He says we can locate it; he admits we do not need to get the consent of the company; and, therefore, we locate it. We do not get their consent. Now, up to what time is our discretion free, and when is it restrained? It never is restrained; we have full discretion as to the location at all times, and we are restrained by no legal limitation whatever, but only by our sense of what is in the interest of the road and of the people.

Mr. DEVLIN: What interpretation does the Solicitor General give to the word "work" in the seventh line of section 17, where it says that the work shall be done according to the specifications. Does it mean the undertaking?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It means the Transcontinental railway. But would it not be well for me to finish with this opinion, now that I am in the middle of it, before we get into another section?

This discretion is not limited or affected by clause 7, which provides only for approval by the company of the specifications for construction and joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the work of construction by the chief engineers of the Government and the company.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is only quoting from the Act. But his minister stated what that meant and all it meant, and with that he and the hon. member to his right (Mr. Graham) are entirely in disagreement to-night, because it suits them in order to oppose this resolution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN (reading):

The agreement is by law to be construed favourable to the Government, but even without invoking this canon of construction it is not thought possible to hold that there are any words or implication in clause 7 entitling the company to a voice in the location of the eastern division. This section refers to specifications for construction and work of construction, which are matters quite distinct from location. A very clear opinion and a very reasonable opinion, I think.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think so, too.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The location precedes the making of the specifications, does it not?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, the location is first made by the engineers, and then the specifications are made upon the location.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: He does not know that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it not entirely consistent with the opinion of the late Minister of Justice that while the Government fix the original location, when the specifications are completed there can be no change without joint approval?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all. Whatever the Government has uncontrolled determination of, that uncontrolled determination continues from the beginning to the end; what they have not uncontrolled determination of they cannot change once that point in the specifications is agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And the conclusion of my hon. friend on this opinion is that when the line has been located in a certain part, the shops necessary to operate that line can be located nine miles away from that line.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The location of the shops is within the discretion of the Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Exactly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And my right hon. friend exercised that and built the Transcona shops five miles away from the terminal point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: On the road.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But they have to go five miles.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, they do not. They would have if they started from Winnipeg, but they do not all have to go to Winnipeg.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does he mean that cars going to Winnipeg would stop five miles out for repairs? The right hon. leader of the Opposition says that this has all been decided by arbitration—that we had to

build the Transcona shops and the Quebec shops. His Government was committed to both shops, at Quebec and at Transcona, by reason of opinions given at the time upon which they relied. There were opinions to the contrary, and that question was never referred to the board of arbitration of which Sir William Whyte was chairman.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Was it not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the question that was referred to Sir William Whyte—and I am sure the hon. member for Renfrew will bear me out in this—was not whether it was upon the Government of Canada or upon the Grand Trunk Pacific to build those shops. What was referred to him was the matter of the rentals, the terms upon which the Grand Trunk Pacific were to get a lease of the line from Lake Superior junction to Winnipeg, and some other questions also involving cost of construction that were at issue between the company and the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: Let me put my hon. friend right, because he is altogether wrong. One of the questions referred by the Minister of Railways and Mr. Chamberlin to Sir William Whyte was:

Are the shops at Transcona and repair shops at divisional points or any of them to be regarded as a portion of the eastern division?

There was also a question about rental, but that question about the shops was asked plainly. My hon. friend has asked me a question, so that we had better clear the matter up now. The contention of the Minister of Railways and of the Solicitor General is that the question submitted to Sir William Whyte was not, are the shops a part of the eastern division, but, what rental should be paid if they are not? Let me just put the question as the Minister of Railways put it, and then I will give the award of Sir William Whyte, because it will clear up beyond a peradventure that his award was that these shops at every divisional point are a part of the National Transcontinental railway, and that the road cannot be conveniently operated without the completion of those shops. This is the reference made by the Minister of Railways and Mr. Chamberlin:

Ottawa, Dec. 4, 1912.

Sir William Whyte,
Winnipeg.

Will you act as sole arbitrator between the Government and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway to fix the rental to be paid for use of that portion of the Transcontinental railway line between Winnipeg and lake Superior junction pending completion of the entire line

[Mr. Meighen.]

through to Moncton? If so, necessary information will be sent you directly and arrangements made with the Grand Trunk Pacific officials at Winnipeg to furnish train so that you can go over the line and make the necessary examination; also any other information.

It was agreed that the following questions should be submitted to Sir William Whyte.

Mr. MEIGHEN: By whom?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister of Railways and Mr. Chamberlin. I am going to read the submission as it appeared in the official correspondence placed on the table a year ago:

(1) What is a fair rental for the use of that portion of the eastern division between Winnipeg and Lake Superior junction, exclusive of the shops hereinafter mentioned, until the eastern division is completed, sufficient for operation within the intent and meaning of the agreements and Acts hereinafter mentioned, with a ferry at Quebec?

(2) Are the shops at Transcona and repair shops at divisional points or any of them to be regarded as a portion of the eastern division, within the intent and meaning of the agreements of July 29, 1903, and of February 18, 1904, and Acts confirming the same?

(3) If not, what is a proper rental for the use of such shops, or any of them, by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for any railway purposes they may desire until the eastern division is completed sufficient for operation?

I think it will be agreed that question No. 2 plainly states the case as I stated it: Are the shops at all divisional points a part of the eastern division? Here is the award of Sir William Whyte, who heard everything in connection with the case:

With respect to the shops at Transcona, considering their location and the circumstances under which they were produced and furnished, and the specifications; and interpreting the said agreements and Acts in the light of modern railway practice, and considering the contemplated use of the said eastern division by other railways, I award, order and determine that the said shops are to be regarded as and are a portion of the said eastern division within the intent and meaning of the said agreements of the 29th of July, 1903, and the 18th of February, 1904, and Acts confirming the same.

Further, he did not stop there. The balance of his finding refers to the shops at Quebec and other divisional points. Hon. gentlemen will pay strict attention to what Sir William Whyte says if they wish to hear the decision of one of the greatest railway men America ever had—a man whom the Minister of Railways had such confidence in that he referred this very question to him. What does he say as to the shops at divisional points, and as to their necessity to the operation of the road:

I further award, order and determine that all repair shops at divisional points are to be regarded as and are a portion of said eastern division within the intent and meaning of the said agreements of 29th July, 1903, and of the 18th February, 1904, and of the Acts confirming the same. I consider these are a material part of the railway and necessary convenience for its proper and efficient operation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is as the hon. gentleman said it was referred to him, but that does not contradict what I stated was not referred to him: that is, whether or not it was incumbent to build those shops as a part of the road. If the Government builds them under the Transcontinental Commission the Government by that act admits they are a part of the road, and there could be no other finding. The Government had long before submitted to its own Minister of Justice and Deputy Minister of Justice the question whether or not they should build them, and they had determined to build them. After that, whether right or wrong, they became a part of the road of course. But how does that affect the present discussion?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend made a statement that—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I made the statement that the question whether or not they should be constructed was never referred to him.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were built before that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The question was this. If they were improperly built, then there was no rental on them; but if they were a part of the road and properly built there was rental.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I agree with that, but the very fact that they were built under the commission was an admission that they were part of the road.

Mr. GRAHAM: Several of them were not built.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The work was under way.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Quebec shops had not been started.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no reference to him about that at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a divisional point, and so would be included.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Transcona shops was all that was referred to Sir William Whyte.

Mr. GRAHAM: The shops at all divisional points.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were a part of the road undoubtedly. The Government decided that the shops should be built as part of the road.

Mr. GRAHAM: After this award the Government gave the contract.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the Grand Trunk Pacific took the line over under rental. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has made some other suggestions that he thinks we should act upon. He says if we pass this resolution it involves an expenditure of $30,000,000 or $40,000,000. He is doing the best he can to establish a value for the Grand Trunk Pacific in case they stand solid on the rental and we are bound to expropriate. Anything he can do, he is going to do in order to saddle on the Government as large an expenditure as possible. There is nothing in the resolution compelling us to buy or acquire the road.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why then do you ask for authority?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As I have already explained, in order that we may not be compelled to lease from them at their figures, in order that we may have an alternative, and in order that they will be more likely to be fair and reasonable in deciding on the terms. Those are all the powers asked for. But, says the hon. member for St. John, here is your agreement for 1904. If you just act upon that, that is all you need to do. He says that a way is pointed out in clause 3 of the agreement of 1904, and that if we simply take that up with the Grand Trunk Pacific all our difficulties will be solved. What is that clause 3?

Pending the completion of the eastern division by the Government, the company shall be entitled to lease from the commissioners, to be appointed under the said Act, and to operate such portions of the said eastern division as may from time to time be completed, but upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the company and the said commissioners, which terms are not to be more onerous than those of the lease of the whole division by the said contract provided for, save in so far as may be necessary to give full effect to the paramount right of the said commissioners next hereinafter mentioned, and subject always to the paramount right of the said commissioners to use and operate the same without any payment of tolls or other compensation for such purposes as they

may deem necessary or expedient in the execution of their commission.

In other words, that clause gives the Grand Trunk Pacific the right to demand from the Government power to lease any portion of the road as it becomes complete, but upon terms not more onerous than those upon which they could lease the whole line were it complete. We are in this position: the Grand Trunk Pacific have the right to lease the whole line as it is now upon the terms of their contract. They have the right to call upon us to lease the line upon terms not more onerous and my hon. friend says that they now take the position that they would take over this road even were they to rely upon clause 3 because they have a right to demand a lease on terms not more onerous. If they would not take these terms under which they would pay no rent at all how does the hon. gentleman expect us to make a lease and get some rent from them? They are now in a position to take over the road and pay no rental for seven years. We act not at all upon this resolution unless they refuse to do it. Assume that they have refused to take over the line and run it rent free for seven years, what success are we likely to have in asking them to enter into a lease which involves the payment of rent?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Surely the hon. gentleman could not have heard my words else he would not have made that statement. I referred to the arrangement which the late president, Mr. Hays, proposed to make and which I understood, in conversation with Mr. Chamberlin, they were willing to make after this Government came into power—that is, that they would equip the completed sections with proper rolling stock and operate them subject to Government supervision and Government audit.. If there was any surplus the Government would get the benefit of it, and if there was a deficit that should be added to capital account, upon which they should pay interest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I knew that the hon. gentleman referred to that matter. That was the alternative that he proposed, but afterwards he came to section 3 and called upon us to act under section 3.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was based on section 3.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And section 3 gave the company the right to run the road on certain terms. They now refuse to take it and run it for nothing, and the hon. gentleman expects us to make a bargain with them to run it on terms. If they take the road now, of course this resolution will not be acted upon. Let us take the hon. gentleman's other suggestion. It is this: We ought to make a bargain with the company whereby they would operate the line and if there was a deficit it would be added to capital account upon which they would later pay interest. The hon. gentleman will see that that involves an additional obligation, an additional burden upon the company. It means that the annual deficits will pile up and accumulate, and that the already large rental which the company will be called upon to pay under the agreement will be added to by that means. It involves that obligation, that additional burden, on the back of the company, and a very heavy additional burden it will be.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why do you assume that there will be a deficit?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman assumed that. He said that the annual deficit would be added to capital account and that they would pay interest upon it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I said that if there was any profit it would be handed in, and if there was any deficit it would be added to capital.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there was any profit the company would get it, and if there was a deficit we would pay it and add it to capital.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Surely the hon. gentleman must be doing that intentionally? Why does he misquote? I did not say that if there was any surplus or profit it should go to the company. I said that if there was any surplus it would go to the treasury, to the country, and that if there was a deficit it would be added to capital.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought the hon. gentleman said that it would be paid to the company. If there is any profit it goes to the country and if there is any deficit it is to be added to capital and the company pay interest upon it. Consequently the company cannot make a dollar out of the proposition and it will be only adding to the burden—

Mr. PUGSLEY: They offered to enter into it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman show me where they offered to do that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I may say to my hon. friend again, so that there will be no doubt about it, and I am speaking in the presence of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and of the former Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), that it was at a meeting, where we were considering the whole question of operating the sections. A subcommittee of Council composed of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who was then Prime Minister, the then Minister of Railways and Canals, the then Minister of Finance and myself met with Mr. Hays, president of the company, and Mr. Hays made that clear and distinct statement. Since that time Mr. Chamberlin has repeated that statement in my presence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he company were in a mood like that when the hon. gentleman was Minister of Public Works, and his Government were in office, and if they were willing to enter into a bargain where they had no chance to make a dollar and a great chance to lose, I wonder why, with a company in that mood, the hon. gentleman did not make a better bargain than he did. Ready to make a bargain whereby, if there is a profit, it goes to the country and whereby if there is a loss they are prepared to pay the interest on it! A business company ready to make a bargain of that kind!

Mr. PUGSLEY: They would get their operating expenses.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is to say they would get the money that they paid and I have no doubt they would appreciate the privilege they had of getting back all the money they had paid out. This resolution becomes operative if they refuse to take the road over. They have the right to run the road now for seven years for nothing and if they have any profit they have a right to take it. We assume that they have refused that proposition to take the profit and run the road for nothing. Having refused that they will be quite ready, the hon. gentleman says, to enter into another bargain, namely, one whereby they would not have any profit at all but would pay the interest on the loss. If the company do not refuse we have no resolution, or the resolution will not go into operation. But the hon. gentleman says that a company that has refused to operate for nothing and take the profits, would be quite ready to operate, give the profits to the public and pay interest on the loss.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why do you not see if they will do that? I venture to say that if you honestly tried to get them to do it they would do it, as the Minister of Railways and Canals assured the committee he would try.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Railways and Canals has not told the committee yet of the way that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company treated the proposal which my hon. friend said they would willingly enter into. Surely the absurdity of it would appeal to any person to suggest that a company that has the right to run the road for nothing and take the profits, and which has refused that, is going to consent to run the road, pay the profits, if any, into the Government and pay the interest on the deficit.

I wish to make an explanation on a point raised by the hon. member for St. John. When he spoke he raised the question of compound interest and asked me about it. I told him that it had been computed by the auditor, and that no instructions had been given to the auditor. At the time I had received an intimation which I understood to imply that it was compound interest.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That it was simple interest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is quite right; I understand the auditor to say that it was computed on the basis of simple interest. I have seen the auditor since, and I find that I misunderstood his intimation to me, and that it is compound interest. There were no instructions given to the auditor at all. The statute was before him when he made the calculation, and the auditor determined upon his own judgment absolutely that the statute called for a compound interest calculation. I do not want to act as judge upon this point, but I wish to say that the hon. member for St. John quite overstated the matter when he said that the statute was very clear that no compound interest should be charged. Certainly, the country has to pay compound interest upon it; certainly the least to be said is that one would have thought that it would be called for. It seems, upon reading the section, that if anything the view of the auditor is better than that of the hon. member for St. John. How does the section read?

The expression "cost of construction," in the case of the eastern division, shall mean and include all the cost of material, supplies, wages, services and transportation, etc.... cost of engineering, maintenance, repairs and replace-

ment of works and material during construction, and superintendence, bookkeeping, legal expenses, and, generally, costs and expenses occasioned by the construction of the said division, whether of the same kind as, or different in kind from, the classes of expenditure specially mentioned, including interest upon the money expended;—

That is to say, that in the outlay of any year, the interest outlay of that year is a part of the cost of construction. I will ask the hon. member to remember that.

—the interest upon such outlay—

Which means the interest upon the annual outlay, including interest—

—the interest upon such outlay in each year shall be capitalized at the end of such year, and interest charged thereon at three per cent per annum until the completion of the work, and until the lessees enter into possession under the terms of the said lease.

It is a question of what the word "outlay" means, and if "outlay" means, as a reasonable interpretation would say, the cost of construction during the year before, then certainly it is compound interest. If it means the same as the "cost of construction" of the year before then it is compound and it can be nothing else, because, in the course of construction, the interest payment of that year is included. So that it would mean the interest upon (x plus y) all payments for other purposes and all payments for interest.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is added to the outlay in that year, of course, and then at the end of the year that represents the expenditure of that year. The Act says it shall bear interest at three per cent until the completion of the line, but not that that interest shall be compounded each year as has been done here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If interest shall include interest outlay during the year, then it includes the interest upon outlay during the year, and, consequently, interest upon outlay means interest upon interest outlay.

Mr. PUGSLEY: True it is the interest for that year which is added, but then the statute goes on and says that that total outlay for that year including the interest shall only bear interest at three per cent until the road is completed. Suppose a man gives a note of $1,000 payable in ten years at 6 per cent, you cannot compound up that interest every year, but at the end of the period you get your principal amount and the interest at 6 per cent.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: If, on the other hand, it says that interest in each year shall be part of outlay, and that interest shall be capitalized at the end of the year, that means compound interest. However, I am not arguing that there is no other view reasonably tenable; I am only arguing that the auditors had very good ground for their view, and in my humble judgment they have the better ground of the two. The auditors followed this view and took this course upon their reading of the Act, and asked for no opinion upon it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the legal opinion of the Solicitor General?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My own opinion is that the auditors' view is more reasonable than that of the hon. member for St. John. I am not in the habit of deciding things and saying there is no possible other view at all; I am not of that habit especially when I possessed just a few years ago an entirely different opinion, and that is the position the hon. member for St. John is in to-night.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes. He argued to-night that the question of location is as much a matter for the Grand Trunk as for us, when he knows that his Government acted upon the very opposite opinion given by the Minister of Justice of that day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I know they did not. When the location is once agreed upon and the specifications based on it, that is the end of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The question of location, according to his own Minister of Justice, never had to be agreed upon.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What has placing the workshops nine miles away from the line of the Transcontinental and buying a road from another company, got to do with the location of the line? Is not that changing the whole character of the terminals so far as the workshops are concerned?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is changing the location, that is all; changing that portion of its character, but nothing else, and that is something within the purview of the Government alone, and has always been held to be.

What I am now about to say does not concern the issue, but I promised the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that

I would call attention to his own words and appeal to the House as to whether I did not properly represent him. To do so, I will read the statement that preceded the remarks of the hon. member. Some discussion ensued between him and the Minister of Militia as to certain allegations which on certain information the hon. gentleman from St. John had made, and this took place:

> Major General Hughes: The hon. gentleman has not the slightest particle of evidence that there is a tittle of fact in what he has stated, and he cannot produce any. He cannot show that the British Government in Britain, in Canada, in the United States, or in any other part of God's green universe, ever was able to get mark vii ammunition at less than $35 a thousand, excepting the one lot that I had the honour of being instrumental in getting for $33 per thousand.
>
> Mr. Pugsley: My hon. friend may be absolutely correct. I have not the slightest idea as to whether I am correct or not. It may be that the gentleman who gave me this information gave me false information.

Is not that just about what I said? And so we see from this that the hon. gentleman took upon himself to impugn the honour of the Government upon information which he had not the slightest idea was correct or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think the hon. member is right in saying that I impugned the honour of the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman said that it involved the honour of the Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I was careful to state that I did not make any charge against the Government. I was careful to state I had received this information in New York from a gentleman in whose word I placed confidence, a gentleman of the highest respectability; but that, so far as I was concerned, I did not know whether the statement were correct. I was careful to say I made no charge against the Government or against the minister.

Mr. DEVLIN: What, in the opinion of the Solicitor General, is the meaning of the word " railway " in line 7 of section 7 of the contract? The hon. gentleman has told us that the word " work " means the whole railway. What would be the definition of the word " railway "; would it be the same definition as is contained in the general Railway Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the general Railway Act applies at all. I say that the word " railway " has no definition in this Act, and that is the complaint I make. What the hon. gentleman asks me to do now is to fill up the blank in the Act, which the Government he supported should have filled up by direct legislation.

Mr. DEVLIN: As a member of the House I was asking the Solicitor General what in his opinion was the meaning of the word " railway."

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that I should be called upon across the floor to give a definition of " railway " or any other thing. What I say is that the definition of " railway " and of " completed railway " should have been made in the Act itself, beyond all peradventure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It was.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not made as to " completed railway."

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where is the definition?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will tell you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no definition of a completed railway or what constitutes the completeness of a railway, and that is the point my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) has in mind. What constitutes the completion of a railway is not defined in this legislation, and it ought to have been.

Mr. DEVLIN: The point is, what is really the meaning of the word " railway." Section 7 says:

> The work must be under the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the Government and the chief engineer of the company.

The Solicitor General says the word "work" means the whole railway, and I now ask him the definition of the word "railway"?

Mr. MEIGHEN That is to say, is the railway complete until there are shops and the like of that?

Mr. DEVLIN: I am not asking that; I am asking the Solicitor General for a definition of the word "railway" as he understands it in this contract; it must have some meaning.

Mr. MEIGHEN; I do not propose to commit myself to a definition, because, in the first place, it would do no good to do so. There was a time when it would do good, and that time was

overlooked by the Government which the hon. gentleman supported. It will now have to be submitted to another tribunal.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would the Solicitor General say, as Solicitor General, that the word "railway" would not mean:

"Any railway which the company had authority to construct or operate, including all branches, sidings, stations, depots, wharves, rolling stock, equipment, stores, property real and personal, and works connected therewith, and also any railways, bridges, tunnels or other structure which the company is authorized to construct."

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is so easy that I really cannot help answering it. In my opinion, "work" does not include rolling stock at all, because we have nothing to do with rolling stock; the company has to supply that. The hon. gentleman's definition is wrong, whatever other definition may be right.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would it mean all the stations of the road?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would mean stations of the railway, of course. It might not mean all the stations.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would not the terminal stations be the stations of the railway?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They might and they might not. That is to be decided.

Mr. COCHRANE: What the hon. gentleman is driving at is this: there is a station for the company to go into at Quebec just as there is at Winnipeg.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I shall be very brief in explaining to my hon. friend why I think the Grand Trunk Pacific were willing, when Mr. Hays was living, and would be willing to-day, to make the arrangement about which I spoke. The result would be, to begin with, that they would get their operating expenses. Then they would be developing traffic which in the future would be for the benefit of the country served by that railway. While operating, they would be at the same time postponing the period when they would be obliged to begin to pay interest. My hon. friend must see that. Therefore it would be very much more favourable for the company to take sections and even the whole line before it was finally completed than it would be to enter into a lease under which their obligations to pay rent would begin at a certain time. The company might be willing to make the arrangement of which I spoke and which they expressed themselves formerly as willing to make, while they would not be willing to enter into a lease for an uncompleted road, under which, as I have said, the term for payment of interest would begin to run. The best way to find out is to ask them if they are now willing to carry out the proposed agreement.

Mr. OLIVER: The discussion so far has been in regard to the eastern end of the Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise. It strikes me that the western end is more important, and I wish to call the attention of the House for a few minutes to the effect of action that may be taken under this resolution. The resolution contemplates the taking over by the Government of the portion of the Grand Trunk Pacific line from Lake Superior junction to Fort William, with the terminals. That piece of line is necessary to give the Grand Trunk Pacific system, measurably grid-ironing the three prairie provinces and British Columbia, a competitive outlet to lake navigation. If the Government takes action under this resolution and deprives the Grand Trunk Pacific of that access to lake navigation, it will be prejudicing in large measure the operations of the company throughout the three prairie provinces and British Columbia.

Mr. COCHRANE: But they would have to get connection from Winnipeg to Lake Superior junction, supposing the arrangement were carried out. They would need to enter into a contract for that.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. I will reach the point that my hon. friend has in mind a little later on.

At the present time the Grand Trunk Pacific has a railway system in large measure covering the four western provinces, which system is dependent for its commercial success, in larger measure than on any other factor, on having independent access on competitive terms to the navigation of the Great Lakes. They have that connection now under some arrangement—I do not know what it is—with the Government, covering that part of the line from Winnipeg to Lake Superior junction, and then by the use of this branch which is their own. I am compelled to understand, from the terms of this resolution, and more particularly from the expressions of the Solicitor General in regard to it, that it is the deliberate intention of the Government under this legislation to deprive the Grand

Trunk Pacific system of that access to lake Superior, which is an absolute necessity to its successful business operation. The Government proposes to take over this section of the line, which is the property of the Grand Trunk Pacific, with its terminals, with the elevators, with all the port facilities which have been established there by the Grand Trunk Pacific at the cost of that railway, to aid in the successful operation of those thousands of miles of line in the Prairie Provinces and the Pacific province. I do not imagine that the House understands the stupendous character of the proposal before it. My hon. friend the Solicitor General, if I heard him correctly, spoke of the necessity, by this legislation, of taking over the property of the Grand Trunk Pacific—of expropriating—

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I did not.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. member used the word "expropriate."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I did; but the hon. member has never been unfair to me before, and he does not mean to be now. What I said was that if we had to operate the road, then we had to lease or acquire, and that we desired the power to acquire, because it might otherwise be impossible for us to make an advantageous lease.

Mr. OLIVER: Exactly. My hon. friend used the word "expropriate" and also the word "weapon." The Government proposes to use this as a weapon in dealing with the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why should it not?

Mr. OLIVER: I understand there is an intention on the part of the Government to use this agreement as a weapon to do what?

Mr. MEIGHEN: To get a fair bargain.

Mr. OLIVER: As a weapon to compel the Grand Trunk Pacific to submit to a rearrangement of their agreement in regard to the eastern division of the Transcontinental.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. OLIVER: That is the only purpose there could be in using this arrangement as a weapon. I am not interested particularly in whether or not the Government takes the Grand Trunk Pacific by the throat and uses this agreement as a weapon to deprive it of the possibility of operating properly its system in the prairie provinces and the Pacific province. That is a matter of Government policy; and, if the Government sees fit to adopt that policy, that is for the Government to consider. What I am interested in is this: the Grand Trunk Pacific project was begun for the especial purpose of giving Western Canada railway development and railway competition, And my hon. friends propose by this means to take into their hands the power to deprive the Prairie Provinces and British Columbia of the possibility of their enjoying that competition in railway facilities that was the purpose of the establishment of the enterprise. If the Government of the day actually does as they have taken power to do, how is the Grand Trunk Pacific to carry on its business as a competitor with the other two railway systems of the West, both of which not only have access to the waters of Lake Superior, but also have, or shortly will have, all-rail connection with the East? If they take the control they have arranged to take here, they break, the Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise; and that, I am bound to believe, is their deliberate intention. As to the use of the Bill to be founded upon this resolution as a weapon to compel the Grand Trunk Pacific to enter into an agreement as to operating the eastern section of the railway on unfair terms—

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not that at all.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend will have to admit that, or he used the word inadvisedly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is misquoting me. I said not to affect in any way the operating of the eastern division. If they are ready to operate the eastern division, we are only too ready to let them. If they refuse to operate, where is their eastern outlet that my hon. friend is so much afraid of?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not think it would be profitable for my hon. friend and myself to argue about the meaning of the terms he used. There is no question about the use of the term; there is no question about the connection in which he used it. I am, therefore, entitled to put my construction upon the purpose he had in the use of these terms, as he is at liberty to put such construction on what I say.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So long as you quote correctly what I said.

Mr. OLIVER: And the hon. gentleman will not deny—he cannot deny, for Hansard

will show it—that he used the word " expropriate," and the word " weapon."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear; but not in the way the hon. gentleman says I did.

Mr. OLIVER: That is the matter that I say it is not profitable for my hon. friend and myself to discuss.

Mr. BURNHAM: Who owns it now?

Mr. OLIVER: Owns what now?

Mr. BURNHAM: The property to be expropriated?

Mr. OLIVER: The Grand Trunk Pacific. It is important that there should be railway competition, and that there should be a competitive outlet for the Grand Trunk Pacific system, not only to the Lakes, but also to tidewater; and it is in regard to the terms upon which the Grand
11 p.m. Trunk Pacific shall secure access to tidewater that this resolution is brought forward—as my hon. friend says—as a "weapon" to compel the Grand Trunk Pacific—he did not use the word "compel"; I am using it—to agree to something that the Government is not entitled, on the merits of the case, to require them to agree to. Now, as to the right of the Government to claim breach of faith on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific—and that is really the burden of my hon. friend's argument—as to the merits of the case between the Government and the Grand Trunk Pacific concerning the eastern outlet at tidewater, let me give my view of the case concerning where the responsibility rests.

The Grand Trunk Pacific project was finally agreed to in April, 1904. From 1904 until 1911 construction was pushed on that road. In October, 1911, if my memory is correct, a return, placed on the table of the House by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, gave the information that at that time an expenditure of approximately $100,000,000 had been made, and that the road was within, I think, 15 per cent of being completed—it was 85 per cent completed. Details were given showing so much grading, bridging, track laying and other things to be done. The cost had been $100,000,000, approximately, and the time occupied from the very beginning of the enterprise was seven years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have never seen that return.

Mr. OLIVER: The return was laid on the table, and there was a long argument in Parliament about it. The return was brought down and the figures given, for the purpose of affecting the election in South Renfrew, which resulted in the return of my hon. friend (Mr. Graham).

Mr. COCHRANE: I would like to see my hon. friend produce that return.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend surely does not deny that he brought down a return.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think I ever brought down a return showing an expenditure of $100,000,000 at that time.

Mr. OLIVER: Was the expenditure less or more?

Mr. COCHRANE: It was more.

Mr. OLIVER: How much more?

Mr. COCHRANE: I am not prepared to say.

Mr. OLIVER: I may be wrong as to the amount. But for the purposes of the argument I am going to make it would be better if the amount were larger than $100,000,000. Now, let me repeat in seven years the road was 85 per cent completed, and the cost was approximately a hundred millions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that the return stated that it was 85 per cent completed?

Mr. OLIVER: That is my understanding of the return.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. gentleman will have to revise that understanding.

Mr. OLIVER: Perhaps so. I give the figures as approximate and may be a little in error, but approximately, that was the condition. Now, it is three and a half years since 1911, and the expenditure on the Transcontinental has gone up to something like—should I be wrong if I said, $150,000,000?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER: Has it gone over that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman include interest?

Mr. OLIVER: I include anything the hon. gentleman includes. I take it any way he figures it. How does he figure it out?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That depends on the basis on which the hon. gentleman wishes it figured out. Does he include interest?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, anything the hon. gentleman likes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The expenditure is over $170,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER: We will say it was $170,000,000 at December 31, 1914, and that it was $105,000,000 or $110 000,000 at the 1st of October, 1911—and it was no more than that. The road was 85 per cent completed then, and it is not completed yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not 85 per cent completed then.

Mr. OLIVER: I said it was. I may be a little in error. Will my hon. friend say how much it was?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not nearly that. The hon. gentleman's figures show it was not nearly that.

Mr. HANNA: The hon. member for South Renfrew put it at 55 per cent last year in the discussion of the Transcontinental—55 per cent completed when this Government took office.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know what the hon. member for South Renfrew said.

Mr. GRAHAM: Neither does the hon. member.

Mr. OLIVER: I am taking the return submitted by the Minister of Railways when the hon. member for South Renfrew was not in the House. What I wanted to say was that the railway was certainly more than 75 per cent completed in the fall of 1911, and since that time this Government has spent upon the railroad more than one-half as much as was spent in the seven years previously, and if the railroad is not completed now, it is the fault of this Government, which has squandered money in such stupendous volume without putting it to proper use. If the Goverment of the day had spent the money which they have spent as the Government which preceded them spent the money, that they spent, there would be no dispute to-day as to whether or not the Transcontinental was ready for operation. The Grand Trunk Pacific would not have a leg to stand on in arguing that they were under no obligation to take over the road. My hon. friend would not be in the position that, by an Act of this Parliament, he must take the property of the Grand Trunk Pacific to use it as a weapon to compel the company to agree to take over the road when it has not been completed. There is no reason why this Transcontinental railroad is not completed at this date, except the policy of the Government of the day.

Mr. COCHRANE: Who let the contracts for the road?

Mr. GRAHAM: The late Government did not let any contracts for the changes in Quebec.

Mr. COCHRANE: I know you did not, and you did not do any work there; that is more.

Mr. OLIVER: It does not make any difference who let the contracts. Now that my hon. friend has mentioned it all the contracts were let before the present Government came into power, and if they did not see that these contracts were fulfilled as they ought to have been, it was not the fault of the Government that let the contracts.

Mr. COCHRANE: The contracts in Quebec were let to be finished in 1907, and they were not finished when we came into power.

Mr. OLIVER: That is right, they are not finished yet, so that my hon. friend is not gaining anything in the race at all.

Mr. COCHRANE: That may be your opinion.

Mr. OLIVER: The fact that the road is not completed to-day is not because there has not been time enough or because there has not been money enough spent, but because it has not been the policy of this Government to carry that project to successful and satisfactory completion. It has been the settled and fixed policy of this Government to prevent the realization of the expectations of railroad competition throughout Canada, and particularly throughout Western Canada, as the result of the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise, that was the very reason for its inception. That is absolutely in line with the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite from the day that the project was first brought into Parliament. They opposed it in 1903 and in 1904 they fought the project until the snow flew in October—from spring until fall. From that day to this they have done everything in season and out of season, by word of mouth but still more by executive action, to prevent the successful completion of this project and the realization of the expectations resulting from it. Here we have the climax. The rails are laid from end to end of the road. There is no reason

why the terminals should not have progressed as the building of the road progressed; but we find the road laid and the terminals still to be built and our hon. friends contend that the company should take over the road without the terminals being completed! The Minister of Railways says: Why, they can get down to tide water, they can use the Canadian Pacific railway station, they can transact their business. My friend the Solicitor General was very sarcastic about the amount of business there was for them to transact. Perhaps there is not very much business for them to transact, perhaps they could transact their business under the circumstances that exist at the present time. But I ask my hon. friend if he expects that a company that raises as many millions of dollars of capital for expenditure in this country as the Grand Trunk Pacific has done, is going to enter into an agreement that makes it responsible for large payments in regard to its enterprise, if the terms of the agreement have not been completed in regard to terminals and the company is expected to transact its business with such facilities as are offered to it at Quebec today. I say no, that is not reasonable.

So that there may be no question as to what the condition of the railroad was as to completion on the 31st of December, 1911, I would cite the return submitted to Parliament by the Minister of Railways as follows:

Recapitulation: Length, 1,804.7 miles from Moncton to Winnipeg.
Grading completed, 1,587.7 miles, or 76 per cent in 21 contracts.
Track laid, 1,378.7 miles and 278 miles in sidings.
Telegraph lines, 892 miles.
Bridges, 82 per cent.

That was the condition of construction at that time.

Mr. ROGERS: It is a long way from 85 per cent.

Mr. OLIVER: But it is more than 75 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And that only covers part of the railway.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know. My hon. friend will have to settle that with the Minister of Railways, who saw fit to lay on the table of the House a certain statement in regard to the construction of that railroad. I have given the House the figures, and my argument is that, taking over the road in that state of completion, the Government has not used due diligence in the years that have followed in the matter of the expenditures they have made; and if there is a question to-day as to the Grand Trunk Pacific taking the road over, the fault lies with this Government in carrying on its policy of hostility to the Grand Trunk Pacific project, and hostility to the principle of railway competition in Western Canada.

Mr. COCHRANE: One of the last contracts on the line to be finished was the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend is complaining about what occurred under his own Administration.

Mr. COCHRANE: Oh no.

Mr. OLIVER: The Government must shoulder responsibility for its own administration. We are charged with having been responsible for the past expenditure on the Grand Trunk Pacific. Are we to be also charged with the delay in its completion? I say that we are not chargeable either for the large expenditure that has taken place under the hon. minister, or for the delay in the completion of the work. The Government is surely a government that is responsible for what it does. Surely the men who went out of office in 1911 are not responsible for what the Government of the day is doing in 1915. I say that this proposed legislation is simply carrying out the policy that has been uniformly followed by the party now in power from the inception of this enterprise to the present—a policy of hostility to the success of the enterprise and hostility to the principle of railway competition in Western Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In introducing the resolution I understood the Minister of Railways to say that it was introduced for the purpose of authorizing the Government to operate the road from Winnipeg to Quebec. I find nothing at all in this resolution to that effect. This resolution applies simply to the acquisition of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway from Fort William to Superior Junction. There is nothing at all about operating the road.

Mr. COCHRANE: Perhaps I did not express myself very clearly. The object is to operate more effectually the whole system. If we were shut off from operating between Fort Willliam and Superior Junction it would be very bad as we should be shut off from getting to the water and during navigation, we should have to haul the wheat by rail all the way. The idea

is to pay for the operation out of consolidated revenue.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I only want to understand exactly where we are. What is the ultimate object of the Government I do not know, but I see that they intend to operate the road. So far so good, or rather so bad. But this resolution is simply to authorize the Government to acquire what now belongs to the Grand Trunk Pacific from Fort William to Superior Junction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The right hon. gentleman will recall that almost exactly a year ago power was given to the Government to operate the Transcontinental. This only enables us more effectually to operate it.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is on the statute book now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand where we are now. Do the words " or otherwise acquire " in the resolution cover expropriation if that may be necessary?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think they are wide enough to include that. We might acquire it without expropriation, of course, were it necessary to acquire it at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the meaning of " or of any other company " ?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That applies to "terminal facilities and accommodation works." The words are meant to cover the event of such terminal facilities or accommodation works not being under the direct title of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, but of a subsidiary company.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What works of any other company are intended to be covered by these words?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not quite sure just what works the term "accommodation works" covers, but that is the phrase usually used in connection with a railway. It is necessary to use those words, I think, in order to get the full effect. The words are in the statutes, and consequently have a judicial meaning. They would mean whatever the court has hitherto decided they do mean. That is what they would mean in this legislation. I presume it would include stations.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is very vague. I have been a pretty long time in Parliament, but this is the first time I have heard of "accommodation works."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Probably repair shops would be included.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Belonging to whom?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Either to the Grand Trunk Pacific, or they may have them under the title of a subsidiary company.

Mr. GRAHAM: We want to be all straight, so that the next time we have a discussion of this question we shall have the figures right. The Minister of Railways insisted that over $100,000,000 had been expended up to the time this Government came into power. I have the figures before me, and if the minister will look up the figures down to March 17, 1911, he will see that it is very much under $100,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: About $95,000.000, but then there was the expenditure of about eight months more to be added to that.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister said it was much over $100,000,000, but this statement shows that the figures given by my hon. friend Mr. Oliver to-night are approximately correct. After that there was about $50,000,000 expended.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: The statement in Hansard says $113,000,000.

Mr. COCHRANE: We only gave a statement of what was actually paid out. My hon. friend owed a great deal of money.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am taking the figures given to-night. There is a statement here, made by Mr. Bell, I suppose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We figured that proportioned over the year it would be about $113,000,000. As the minister has pointed out we have had to pay off millions that the late Government owed, and there are millions under litigation to-day, which we cannot avoid, but as to the disposal of which or including it in the cost of constitution the agreement is silent.

Mr. GRAHAM: The amounts that you are obligated to pay are not in this statement at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that, but it is surely unfair to argue that we have expended on the road since the difference between that and the amount now expended. The hon. gentlemen became obligated to pay out a certain sum of money but they had not paid it.

Mr. GRAHAM: The same argument would apply to my hon. friend. This Government is obligated to payments that they have not yet paid, and these payments will come in another statement as well.

Mr. COCHRANE: And they do not include interest.

Mr. GRAHAM: We were not discussing interest; that is a small matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) was justified in approximating these figures on the statement which he had in his hand. If we cannot depend on statements coming from the Government, as we found to-night we could not, how are we to make our calculations?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The statements are absolutely right. I thought that what the hon. member for Edmonton was trying to present was so absurd that it would not appeal to the hon. member for Renfrew. The former Government paid out $113,000,000, but they were obligated to pay large sums in addition which were not settled but which were in dispute. The interest was not included, but the hon. member for Edmonton includes interest in one case and forgets to include it in the other.

Mr. GRAHAM: You left it for my hon. friend to put in interest or leave it out, and he put it in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I put it in at one end, but I put it in at the other also, and the hon. gentleman should have done the same.

Mr. GRAHAM: If this statement is correct, it does appeal to the hon. member for Renfrew and substantiates my hon. friend from Edmonton absolutely in what he said.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is meant by this:

> For all the purposes of section 9 of the said Act, may provide, by purchase, lease or otherwise, rolling stock and equipment, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and such other company, shall each be authorized on its part to deal accordingly with the said line of railway or terminal facilities and accommodation works as the case may be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 9 of the old Act reads as follows:

> The construction of the eastern division and the operation thereof until completed and leased to the company pursuant to the provisions of the agreement shall be under the charge and control of three commissioners, to be appointed by the Governor in Council.

[Mr. Meighen.]

It will be observed that the clause gives power to the Commission during construction to operate. Last year section 9 was amended, the amendment giving the minister power to operate the road not only during construction but until actually leased and taken over. That is the condition of section 9 now. Therefore, the resolution reads that to fulfil these requirements he may purchase whatever rolling stock may be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

> That subsections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of section 361 of the Railway Act, and section 29, chapter 122 of the statutes of 1903, shall not apply to any such lease or to anything done under the preceding provision.

Mr. GRAHAM: That means that they shall not be referred to the Board of Railway Commissioners or approved by them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, it relieves the Government of the necessity, when making this lease with the company, of having the lease approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a reference to section 29, of chapter 122, of the statutes of 1903.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That means that you cannot amalgamate with another company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 29, chapter 122, 3 Edward VII, is the section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company incorporation charter which provides the terms under which they may enter into an amalgamation or lease. This section corresponds to section 361 of the Railway Act, and in order to carry out the effect of the exception as to the applicability of subsections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the section, we have also to except section 29.

Mr. GRAHAM: You give the companies the power to amalgamate under these conditions?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act does.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to say one further word in line with what I said before. In so far as the operations of the main line of the transcontinental railway from Winnipeg to Quebec is concerned, the Government built that line under an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific, and if they cannot come to an understanding with the Grand Trunk Pacific as to the operation of it, I would certainly think they had a right to withhold it from the

Grand Trunk Pacific and to operate it in any way they please. But I want to point out that the Grand Trunk Pacific have built this section of 150 or 200 miles from Superior junction to Fort William, they have established terminals at Fort William at enormous expense, and they have done this in the full expectation that they were to have the use temporarily of the main line from Winnipeg to Superior junction, so that they could carry on their business until such time as the line from Quebec to Moncton was finished.

Mr. COCHRANE: There is nothing in the Act to say that.

Mr. OLIVER: There is nothing in the Act; I quite appreciate that; but I am talking of this as a business proposition. The Grand Trunk Pacific built that line and went to the expense with that belief and that understanding, and this Government are deliberately undertaking to take from the Grand Trunk Pacific that property which they paid for with the moneys of their bondholders for the purpose of contributing to the success of their main enterprise. There is only one word for that action, and that word is robbery—robbery not in the public interest, but in the interest of the policy of this Government, in the interest of monopoly in transportation.

Mr. ROGERS: I would not speak to-night were it not for the strong language used by my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), and used, though in a milder form, by other hon. gentlemen on his side of the House. We were told to-night that the Transcontinental railway was of national interest to the people of Canada when my right hon. friend introduced the Bill for its construction in 1903, and that that national interest has grown day by day from that hour to the present, by reason of the fact that the Government, as representing the people, have invested an enormous sum of money in the construction of this railway. In the judgment of the Government engineer, the railway is now completed, and the time has arrived when the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company should carry out the terms of the contract it made with the Government in 1904, and operate the railway. I shall not discuss the details of the cost of this railway, nor shall I enter into various other questions which have been raised to-night, but I do want to correct a false impression which seems to exist in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite as to the attitude of this Government towards the Transcontinental railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. I am sure my right hon. friend, and every member on his side of the House, will agree with me that no Government could have adopted a child such as we adopted, in the form of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental, and have been more loyal to it than we have been since we came to power. We are loyal to it by reason of the fact that the Canadian people, whom we represent in this Parliament, have such a large investment in that great undertaking, and we believe that the day has now come when the company should carry out its bargain and operate the line from Winnipeg to Moncton. We feel that in the interests of the people of Canada we must press upon the company to carry out their contract, which up to the present they have failed to do. The Grand Trunk Pacific line from Superior Junction to Fort William and Port Arthur is an essential link in the chain of the Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg to Moncton, and it is inseparably connected with that enterprise. The purpose of the resolution we are now considering is to take power, so that in the event of the Grand Trunk Pacific failing to carry out its agreement we can operate in some form or other that particular link in the chain, which, as I have said, is so essential to the success of the entire scheme.

Let me say most emphatically that it is not the intention of the Government, nor will it be the policy of the Government, to in any way hamper the trade of Western Canada by any action we may take under this resolution. Neither is it the purpose nor desire of the Government to in any way hamper the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific or to in any way interfere with any vested right, or with any interest they have, so long as they deal fairly, and I am satisfied from what I know of the President of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, that the company is disposed to deal fairly. In view of all that has taken place, in view of the enormous cost of the railway,—and I shall not enter now into the question as to who is to blame for that,—while consideration should be given to the objections of the Grand Trunk Railway, there can be no question about the advisability of providing for the operation of this particular line at the present time. The purpose of this resolution is only to ensure that if the Government is obliged to operate the whole line as it is now completed, the Government shall have the necessary power to be able to operate the line from Superior Junction to

Fort William. In so doing, it is not our desire to injure in any way, or to hamper in any way, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Railway Company. It is not correct for hon. gentlemen to say that we bring forward this resolution with a view to hostile action against the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Grand Trunk. The Government have no such thought, and I can assure the House and the country that the Government will continue in the future as in the past to treat this enterprise the same as it has treated all other enterprises, namely, in a spirit of fairness and generosity, which will be creditable to the Government and satisfactory to the people of the Dominion.

Mr. OLIVER: I must congratulate the Government on the statement made by the Minister of Public Works. He will, of course, understand that if we have been led into error it was by reason of the expressions used by his colleague, the Solicitor General, who spoke of this legislation as a weapon which was to be used to compel an agreement by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. But while we are all more than pleased with the conciliatory words of the Minister of Public Works, I want to put it to him and to the House: What is going to happen to the people of the Prairie Provinces and of British Columbia, who depend on the Grand Trunk Pacific railway facilities in these provinces, if and when the Government act under the authority they now take?

Mr. COCHRANE: Do you think any government would be allowed to stay in power ten minutes which would not take all the freight that was offered at Winnipeg, and all the freight offered by the Grand Trunk in the East, and move it over that line. The trouble about operating that line will be to get enough freight for it. There is no government that would be foolish enough to attempt for a minute any other policy.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. member has more faith in governments than I have.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has more reason to.

Mr. COCHRANE: The hon. member has more experience than I have had.

Mr. OLIVER: That may be the reason, but I must say that the experience we have had at the hands of this Government would not lead to his conclusion by any means. If we are to have so much faith in the Government which is going to use this legislation as a weapon against the company, how sure are we that the Government will not continue to use this control of the traffic conditions as a weapon also to compel some other concession. We are not interested in the Grand Trunk Pacific, but we are interested in the people of the West; we are interested in their getting railway facilities and under the best possible circumstances. We are interested in the maintenance of effective railway competition, and certainly we look with very great disfavour upon a condition of affairs that will cut off from the thousands of miles of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway in those Prairie Provinces access to lake navigation on their own lines under their own conditions. As a western man, I would certainly, under those circumstances, seeing that we have the competition of two other roads from the prairies to the lakes, rather trust the Grand Trunk Pacific than this Government. I will not suggest this, but I think it will suggest itself to the minds of a great many people that, if this Government has friends among the railway system of Canada, and if it should be particularly well-disposed towards one or the other or both of the other railway systems in the West, it would be a very easy matter for the Government so to handle its control of this connection between lake Superior and Winnipeg to throw the traffic to those other systems. Who thinks the Government would not do that? I certainly do not, and I think there are very few people in the Northwest who would believe the Government would not do it.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would it not be time to complain when the Government does it?

Mr. OLIVER: No, it would be too late then. I am putting my protest in here and now, at the time when the Government is asking for the authority and power. If the Government takes that power, it takes it in the face of the warning that I have given, and it will certainly have to account to the people in the Northwest for the action it proposes to take.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is not this section from Winnipeg to lake Superior Junction still in the hands of the Government?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT: Until that section is taken over by the Grand Trunk Pacific, they cannot run over their own line to lake Superior.

Mr. OLIVER: No.

Mr. WRIGHT: Therefore the piece of road from Winnipeg to lake Superior is practically valueless to the Grand Trunk Pacific until they get their lease. Until such time as they complete the contract, they are certainly in no better position than they will be if the Government keeps control of it.

Mr. OLIVER: That is perfectly true. The Government owns the line from Winnipeg to lake Superior Junction, and the Government can to-day cut the Grand Trunk Pacific off from the operation of that line when the temporary lease that they have at present runs out.

Mr. COCHRANE: They want to give it up now.

Mr. OLIVER: I have very grave doubts.

Mr. COCHRANE: Grave doubts about my statement?

Mr. OLIVER: About their wishing to give it up.

Mr. COCHRANE: I make the emphatic statement that they do wish to give it up. Now contradict my statement.

Mr. OLIVER: I am sorry to have been thought to be discourteous to the minister. Certainly I did not wish to be so, and I wish to accept unqualifiedly any statement he sees fit to make. I do not wish to be thought for a moment as doubting any statement he wishes to make; but as a matter of business operation, there is no doubt that, as long as the Grand Trunk Pacific wishes to operate from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction, the Government will be just as ill-advised to prevent them from operating as it will be to expropriate this piece of line. It is not the details of the question about which I am worrying; it is the general question that that company, which has thousands of miles throughout the Prairie Provinces, must have the right of access to lake Superior, or they cannot carry on business on a competitive basis with their competitors, and the people of the Northwest must necessarily suffer in traffic facilities as a consequence.

Mr. WRIGHT: If they wanted to get access all they would require to do would be to take over the line.

Mr. OLIVER: They will take over the line if this Government will complete it. The point is that the Government has not completed the line. The Government does not say that it has completed the line; but it is going to take legislation from this Parliament which it will use as a weapon to compel the Grand Trunk Pacific to take over the line without its being completed.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 119, to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

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

Railways and Canals—National Transcontinental railway construction, $5,000,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is that for?

Mr. COCHRANE: I am not going back on my statement. We claim it is for construction, and there will be a lot of things to complete five years from now—yes, ten years from now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Thirty years from now.

Mr. COCHRANE: Fifty years from now.

Mr. OLIVER: The Solicitor General will surely be able to give us some explanation of this $5,000,000 for construction on the National Transcontinental railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman does not understand it, I am afraid the case is hopeless for him.

Mr. OLIVER: The Solicitor General is arguing that the road was completed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Solicitor General has the engineers behind him.

Mr. GRAHAM: Quite a way behind him —$5,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHAN: I have been able to quote exactly what the engineer said.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will this $5,000,000 complete the road?

Mr. COCHRANE: It shows the following expenditures: grading, $1,702,750—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Where?

Mr. COCHRANE: That is paying for grading under these contracts not settled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Work done?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes; right of way, $575,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Where?

Mr. COCHRANE: Well, a portion of it in the city of Winnipeg. We have a lawsuit there. We were sued for nearly $3,000,000 by one company; went to the Exchequer Court and they got judgment for $465,000. Another item is, building, $60,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Building what?

Mr. COCHRANE: The Champlain station —to finish it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will that be finished this year?

Mr. COCHRANE: Oh, yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: "Oh, yes"—I have heard that before; I heard it last year.

Mr. COCHRANE: I know, but I tell the right hon. gentleman it will be. There is $10,000 still due on bridges. Then, Quebec terminals, $2,500,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What terminals?

Mr. COCHRANE: Joint terminals with the Canadian Pacific railway. The Transcona shops will take $30,000, and headquarters salaries and expenses, $40,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the road is completed, headquarters expenses ought to stop.

Mr. COCHRANE: There are old disputes to which we fell heir, disputes seven, eight and nine years old, and it takes some time to straighten them out.

Mr. GRAHAM: And do you need all these overhead expenses for that?

Mr. COCHRANE: That is part of it. My hon. friend knows well that we have to keep some of these engineers that supervise the work if we get into a lawsuit. This totals $5,000,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Of this, $2,500,000 goes to the Quebec terminals. Is that to be paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway for land?

Mr. COCHRANE: We take the land in our own right, and enter into a terminal agreement with them on practically the same basis as that on which the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific have entered into agreement with the Canadian Northern Railway in Winnipeg.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has the land been bought?

Mr. COCHRANE: Most of it, and that which has not been bought has been filed upon.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Not paid for?

Mr. COCHRANE: No. I think there is some land yet to be paid for along the shore up near the Champlain
12 m. market. And if I wanted to be critical and bring politics into this, in my opinion, we could take a good deal of credit for securing that land at so much lower price than was offered in the Exchequer Court—from Wolfe's Cove up to Champlain market. But I have avoided discussions of that kind.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And if I wanted to be critical I would condemn the whole scheme. I understood from the minister's statement that he is buying that land in the right of the Government. My impression of the contract laid on the table last session was that the land was acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the station was to be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we have to pay 2½ per cent upon the total. If that be so, the land must be acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, they hold a certain quantity, but we buy the balance. I can show the right hon. gentleman the plan of the scheme.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I saw the plans. Evidently my impression is wrong. Upon what is this expenditure of 2½ per cent to the Canadian Pacific railway based?

Mr. COCHRANE: We pay 2½ per cent on their land. Then we have a terminal agreement on a pro rata basis. They pay 2½ per cent on our land, so it is as broad as it is long.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do I understand the arrangement to be that we pay 2½ per cent on what is owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway, then we buy the adjacent land and they use it with us? What do they pay?

Mr. COCHRANE: They have land to a certain amount, and on the value of that we pay 2½ per cent. We buy land, and on the price that we pay they pay us 2½ per cent.

Mr. GRAHAM: Can the hon. gentleman tell us now when these works will be completed? Is $5,000,000 sufficient to complete the works on the line which are now incomplete?

Mr. COCHRANE: That will depend to some extent on how the contracts finished are settled. My hon. friend knows that there have been many disputes in the

carrying out of these contracts which have never been settled. We may have to go to the Exchequer Court on many of these. If we can settle these contracts for what they claim, we shall be able to complete the road and pay these besides. The right of way through Ontario has never been settled for. There is some right of way in the province of Quebec and some in the province of New Brunswick that is not settled yet. We have made careful estimates of what we think would be just and fair and have based our Estimates on that.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are shops, the station, the line from the Cap Rouge region down, and yards, etc., to be completed at Quebec. Will this amount complete all of these things?

Mr. COCHRANE: My engineer says so, but I put in the proviso that we are assuming we can settle the debts still owing on the old contracts at a fair figure. We have not done that yet.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will the other work that we have been discussing to-night be finished this year?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Prime Minister, at a gathering at Quebec submitted plans for a tunnel and told them it was to be constructed. That is not included in this?

Mr. COCHRANE: Oh, no; that will cost from a million to a million and a half dollars.

Mr. GRAHAM: It will cost two million dollars.

Mr. COCHRANE: Well, I know. As soon as the business of the road warrants us to going to that expense we will do it.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not intended this year, for what we may call the completion of these works, to include the tunnel?

Mr. COCHRANE: No, we could not this year.

Hudson Bay railway—construction of railway, terminals and elevators, $5,500,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is for the railway and what for the terminals?

Mr. COCHRANE: For the railway, $4,000,000, and for the terminals, $1,500,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is this year's vote?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes, and we have in the Supplementary Estimates a balance that we overran our vote with the contractor for 1914-15.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the condition of the construction of the railway? How many miles of steel and grading, and how many miles of work has been done?

Mr. COCHRANE: The track has been laid to mile 214 from the Pas. The grading is done to mile 293, and the contractor has made arrangements to prosecute the grading between this point and mile 390 during the coming season. There remains the completion of grading to Port Nelson, mile 424, the track-laying from mile 214, and the ballasting, steel bridges and construction of buildings.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the condition of the two bridges across the Nelson river?

Mr. COCHRANE: One is now under contract, the other one is not completely worked out. The engineering difficulties have yet to be settled. They worked on the first bridge across the Nelson river, changed it about and saved a lot of money.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the steel up to the first bridge?

Mr. COCHRANE: No, it is about 24 miles from it, but they are laying it very fast.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the grading beyond the first bridge?

Mr. COCHRANE: Oh yes, the bridge is to be in place by the 15th of September, so that the rails can be laid as far as it is graded next fall, before the snow falls.

Mr. OLIVER: How soon is it expected that the railway will be completed to Port Nelson?

Mr. COCHRANE: I think 1916, but the engineer thinks we will have hard work to do it.

Mr. GRAHAM: He is right.

Mr. OLIVER: In the fall of 1916?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Have any special difficulties developed in the way of handling the grading work?

Mr. COCHRANE: No. To show you to what extent we have secured a straight line, as the crow flies the distance would be 406 miles, and the length of the railway is 424 miles. For that distance, that is pretty good.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister make a statement in regard to the terminals? I asked last year for a plan of the harbour improvements and the estimated cost and time for completion.

Mr. COCHRANE: We have not the plans here. The deepwater channel, about ⅓ mile wide, up the middle of the estuary, is separated from the shore by wide tidal flats over which the water is from one to three feet deep at low water. It is proposed to construct the docks parallel to the deep water channel and distant about 1,000 feet therefrom, the intervening space being dredged about 20 feet at low water. The docks will consist of a cigar-shaped area surrounded with timber cribs and filled in with dredged material. The area will be about 500 feet wide and ¾ (three quarters) mile long, in extreme dimensions. Along the face of the docks the steamer berths will be dredged to 30 feet depth. The elevator will be situated on the above described area, with adequate trackage. The docks will be connected with the shore by a series of crib piers (of large area to resist ice thrust) connected up with steel spans.

They consider this better than a solid pier. The steamer Minto has been up twice to my knowledge right opposite where this dock will be, and that without any dredging. Of course the channel will have to be straightened in some places. The Minto went up, and there were no buoys there, and she got in and out again all right.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the draught of the Minto?

Mr. COCHRANE: Twenty feet. Of course the chief difficulty is that the water from that channel in to the shore is low.

Mr. OLIVER: I understand there is a deep water channel a quarter of a mile wide being dredged.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, it is a natural channel.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the depth of it?

Mr. COCHRANE: The Minto has been up there and she draws twenty feet. I should not think the depth is much more than that.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it the intention to dredge deeper. Ocean steamers draw thirty feet or more.

Mr. COCHRANE: Until the route has been approved I do not think it will be necessary to do more than straighten out the channel. Of course when the route has been settled, most decidedly we shall dredge. The boats can come in there now at high tide, and even at low tide.

Mr. OLIVER: How much dredging has been done up to the present?

Mr. COCHRANE: No dredging has been done. Owing to the long ocean voyage it was necessary to ship the dredge in a more or less "knocked down" condition. That is to say the heavy top hammer of "A" frame, cutterhead ladder, etc., were dismantled and stowed upon the deck. Also consideration of stowage on shipboard made it necessary to ship the pontoons and discharge pipes as separate plates and loose parts (shaped, and punched, with necessary forgings, etc., but not assembled.) It was intended that this assembly work should be done during the winter of 1913-14, so that dredge could be put at work during the summer of 1914. Owing to late arrival at the Bay, desertion of labour and loss of necessary tools in the ship wrecks, this work could not be proceeded with to advantage until the steamers arrived last September, and was not sufficiently advanced to permit of actual work before the close of river operations in the middle of October. The dredge was however tested and the machinery found to be in good working order. She was very late in getting in there last year. She started on July 3, but did not get in until August 14. This year we have our men and plant up there, and hope to make considerable progress.

Mr. OLIVER: Just how much dredging is it intended to do in order to reach deep water?

Mr. COCHRANE: For about 1,000 feet wide, and the length of the dock, which will be about half a mile.

Mr. OLIVER: The Government is undertaking now to dredge and straighten out the channel to deep water.

Mr. COCHRANE: We shall not do the dredging till the last. There will be no trouble in the boats getting in there. A boat drawing twenty feet can get in all right.

Mr. OLIVER: You were rather unfortunate the season before last in the arrival of vessels. How was it last year?

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think we were to blame in any sense of the word. We were unfortunate in not having enough lighters up there. I am satisfied that both

those boats that were lost were deliberately stranded. That is a strong statement to make, but I am sure I am right.

Mr. OLIVER: How many vessels went up?

Mr. COCHRANE: There were 37 passages through the Strait this last summer, notwithstanding the late season. By passages, I mean going and coming.

Mr. OLIVER: The first passage was through at what time?

Mr. COCHRANE: The first steamer got to Port Nelson on August 14.

Mr. OLIVER: How does that compare with the year before?

Mr. COCHRANE: It was eight days later.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it a fact that it was not usual for vessels to get there before the beginning of August?

Mr. COCHRANE: We have been late two years, but I do not blame the route for that. Of course the great difficulty is when you have ice and fog together. With wireless telegraphy there is no danger from one of these conditions alone, as the boats can keep in touch with one another. The shores are high, and there is deep water right up to the shores. We found it paid last year to buy two sailing ships and load them with coal in England and bring them over. We delivered the coal and paid for the ships at a less cost than we could have taken the coal up. These ships had the largest draft of any of the boats up there—22 feet.

Mr. OLIVER: Those boats got in?

Mr. COCHRANE: They were towed in. The boats anchored just a little way out, and the coal was taken out of them and used on our own boats in the channel.

Mr. OLIVER: You brought it up to where the port is likely to be?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: How many miles of deep water are there inside of what you would call the port, that is, in the mouth of the river?

Mr. COCHRANE: Fifteen miles.

Mr. OLIVER: Does that 20 feet depth hold for that distance?

Mr. COCHRANE: It would be more than that in some cases, but you can count on 20. Of course, if a boat with a 30-foot draft waited for high tide she could get in.

Mr. OLIVER: At Fort William there is a stretch of water seven or eight miles long and the water remains deep.

Mr. COCHRANE: That was dredged.

Mr. OLIVER: It was originally pretty deep. Does the 20-foot depth hold for the 15 miles up at Port Nelson?

Mr. COCHRANE: It is 20 feet or more for the whole 15 miles.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers the House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. Thursday.

Thursday, April 1, 1915.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following message from His Royal Highness the Governor General:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have received with great pleasure the address that you have voted in reply to my speech at the opening of Parliament, and thank you for it sincerely.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

READING ROOM—APPOINTMENT OF MESSENGER.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have directed the Clerk of the House to lay on the table of the House my recommendation and his report in connection with the appointment of Mr. Stanley Scott Spencer as messenger in the reading room of the House of Commons.

REPORT.

Seventh annual report of the commissioners for the demarcation of that part of the 141st meridian which forms the boundary between Canada and the United States.—Mr. Roche.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 117, for the relief of Edith Margueritta Lyons.—Mr. Barnard.

Bill No. 118, for the relief of Charles Isaac Alexander.—Mr. McCraney.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

ROYAL PRINT AND LITHOGRAPH CO.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What sum or sums have been paid by the Government, or any department of Government, since March 3, 1914, to the Royal Print and Lithograph Company, Halifax, and what services were performed for the same?

Mr. CODERRE:

Militia and Defence:

Date of Payment.	Services performed.	Amount
1914.		
Nov. 10.	Printing receipt forms, acct. 6-8-14..	$ 1 50
Dec. 29.	Printing 3 time sheets, acct. 30-11-14..	12 00
1915.		
Jan. 15.	Printing receipt forms, acct. 3-11-14..	7 50
Feb. 11.	Printing receipt forms, acct. 6-3-15..	84 00
Mar. 5.	Printing 4,500 enrollment forms, acct. 6-2-15..	8 00
		$113 00

Printing Bureau, $19: Printing 100 poster "Recruits," 100 "Proclamation", 4,000 "Medical Certificate" and "Oath."

Railways and Canals:

1914.			
Mar. 7.	800	circular, safety first.. ..	$ 3 25
" 9.	300	form, cross sections.	$10 00
	3,500	form, daily force return	37 50
	300	form, progress estimates, sec. 1 & 2.	25 00
" 18.	400	estimate of work done..	44 00
" 27.	3,000	form concrete inspection records..	80 00
	500	progress estimate dock, 1st units..	45 00
			241 50
" 4.	2,000	form materials and temperature.. ..	$25 00
	1,000	form add'l. work and material. ..	12 50
	2,000	weekly report form.	18 00
" 12.	800	progress estimate..	20 00
" 4.	2,000	contractors' equipment forms.. ..	20 00
" 12.	1,000	dredging returns..	12 50
			108 00
Mar. 31.	12	Imperial binders, 8½ 14 at $1.15..	13 80
	6	Imperial binders, 8½ x 27 at $2.25..	13 50
	4	Imperial binders, 8½ x 40 at $3	12 00
			39 30
May. 27.	800	prog. estimate forms (S. L.R. record, ruled, printed and punched..	15 00
July 18.	3,000	labels, safety first, 2 colours; 500 label card.	12 75
	500	ribbon for do.. ..	4 50
			17 25
July 31.	1	copy Halifax City Directory, 1914..	4 50
1915.			
Jan. 11.	500	books C.S., No. 256 at 57½c.	287 50
" 20.	4,000	form additional work and materials..	25 00
		Total..	..$747 30

[Mr. McCraney.]

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC AND QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. What amounts have been paid by the Federal Government, before the tenth of October, 1911, for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Quebec bridge?

2. What amounts have been since paid for the same purposes?

Mr. CODERRE:

Railways and Canals:

1. Before October 10, 1911—Quebec bridge expenditure: $8,344,928.09. Before October 10, 1911—Paid under guarantees on Grand Trunk Pacific, $27,691,864.99.

2. Since October 10, 1911 to February 28, 1915, Quebec bridge expenditure: $7,359,675.45. Since October 10, 1911—Paid under guarantees on Grand Trunk Pacific, $43,212.504.71.

MR. T. R. E. McINNES.

Mr. DOUGLAS:

1. Is Mr. T. R E. McInnes in the employ of the Trade and Commerce Department or any other department of the Government?

2. If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?

3. For how long has he been in the employ of the Government?

Mr. CODERRE: Not in the employ of the Government.

AMHERST REDSTONE CO.

Mr. COPP:

1. Has any material been purchased by the Government of Canada from the Amherst Redstone Company since October 12, 1911?

2. If so, what department made said purchase, what quantity was purchased, what price was paid, and where delivered?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1

CANADIAN PATRIOTIC FUND.

Mr. S. SHARPE:

What is the approximate total amount of money paid or subscribed by provinces, and by cities to the Canadian Patriotic Fund, and its branches, including associations not affiliated with, but whose objects are similar in character to that of the Canadian Patriotic Fund.

Mr. CODERRE: The head office of the Canadian Patriotic Fund has no complete

record of the amounts subscribed or moneys promised throughout Canada for patriotic purposes. Only when cash is transmitted to or placed under the control of the honorary treasurer of the central fund are such moneys taken into account. The contributions received by the honorary treasurer up to and including the 30th March, 1915, amount to $3,379,962.28, and New Brunswick has been credited with $33,637.51, and British Columbia with $83,318.58, on account of moneys expended for relief, making a total of $3,496,918.37.

Allocated to the provinces, the contributions are as follows:

General Contributions.

Canadian Patriotic Fund Association, Ottawa, transferred to Canadian Patriotic Fund	$ 75,972 62
Public service of Canada	60,818 10
	$136,790 72

Provinces.

Ontario (sundry contributions)	$ 1,163,103 06
Quebec (sundry contributions, including Canadian Pacific Railway)	1,399,554 43
Nova Scotia, provincial branch Canadian Patriotic Fund	111,689 80
New Brunswick, county branches	121,978 15
Prince Edward Island branch	25,000 00
Manitoba Patriotic Fund (Contributing Association)	88,720 80
Alberta North branch, $64,-191.39; Alberta South branch, $65,467.23; undivided, $20,-178.40	149,837 02
Saskatchewan, provincial branch	141,628 47
British Columbia	141,763 95
Vancouver branch, not yet reported	
Yukon Territory	9,219 95
United States (sundry contritions)	7,632 02
	$3,496,918 37

The National Canadian Patriotic Fund has no means of knowing what sums have been raised or expended for the assistance of soldiers' dependents by local relief committees which have declined to become associated with the National Canadian Patriotic Fund.

Cash sent in by Cities and Towns of Ontario and Quebec up to and including March 22, 1915.

Almonte	$ 14,389 00
Belleville (special)	5,000 00
Berlin	22,756 00
Brantford	11,836 91
Brockville	9,197 56
Buckingham	8,631 90
Cobalt	2,820 00
Copper Cliff (special)	10,023 35
Fraserville, P. Q.	4,011 19
Galt	20,311 23
Granby	4,113 21
Guelph	19,911 70
Hamilton	83,674 65
Hespeler	6,700 00
Kingston	25,000 00
Lachute, P.Q.	2,000 00
Leamington	5,500 00
Montreal (including $50,000 from Canadian Pacific Railway)	1,055,017 04
Oshawa	10,749 68
Ottawa	236,690 15
Owen Sound	6,050 00
Pembroke	10,537 15
Peterboro	21,763 09
Port Arthur	2,000 00
Perth	6,609 00
Prescott	3,979 90
Quebec	148,938 29
Richmond, P.Q.	2,000 00
St. Catharines	17,990 81
St. Thomas and Elgin county	22,500 00
Sault Ste. Marie	9,973 61
Sherbrooke	17,305 68
Smiths Falls	3,812 37
Sudbury	2,000 00
Toronto	466,380 86
Three Rivers	9,843 40
Walkerville (special)	25,000 00
Waterloo	8,565 50
Welland	10,286 52
Windsor Mills	2,143 53

There is at present in press the first report of the National Canadian Patriotic Fund, which it is expected will be ready for general distribution towards the end of the month. This report will contain in detail full information regarding the fund.

CANADIAN PEAT SOCIETY.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Where are the headquarters of the Canadian Peat Society?

2. Who is the president of the society, and where does he reside?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. 22 Castle Building, Ottawa.
2. J. M. Shuttleworth, Brantford, Ontario.

LAUZON DRY DOCK.

Mr. LACHANCE:

1. Did the Government take possession of lands belonging to private individuals for the construction of a dry dock or for other purposes at Lauzon, county of Lévis?
2. (a) What are the names of the proprietors of such lands (b) the names of those who have been paid, and the amount paid to each?
3. What are the names of the land owners who have not been paid, the amount due to each, and the reasons why they have not been paid?
4. (a) what is the date of the taking possession of these lands (b) and when will the proprietors be paid?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes, for the construction of a dry dock.
2 and 3. (a) G. T. Davie & Son; Mrs. Judge Isidore Belleau and Mrs. Mrs. J. S. Murphy; (b) Nothing paid.
4. (a) Possession taken of a part on 15th January, 1913, and balance on 16th July, 1913; (b) When the value is established by the Exchequer Court.

MILITARY SUPPLIES—SHEEPSKINS.

Mr. LACHANCE:

1. Has the Government or the Militia Department since October, 1911, purchased sheepskins with the wool on?
2. If so, from whom, in what quantity, at what date, and for what price?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Yes.
2. A. R. Clarke, Ltd., Toronto; 600; January 12, 1915; $6 each.

MILITARY SUPPLIES—DRUGS, ETC.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Were any drugs or other materials supplied to the Militia Department or the Canadian expeditionary forces by Act Metropole of Toronto?
2. If so, what was the amount of the order?

Major General HUGHES: Yes, blue prints and tracing papers; $43.20.

ST. THOMAS ARMOURY.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Have negotiations taken place for the leasing of the armoury in the city of St. Thomas for school purposes?
2. Have there been negotiations for the sale of the present armoury or for its exchange for other property? If so, what is proposed?

Major General HUGHES: No negotiations have taken place. Private conversations have taken place from time to time, but there has been nothing definite whatever.

[Mr. Marcil.]

SHUBENACADIE POST OFFICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Have any lands been purchased or bargained for at Shubenacadie, N.S., by the Government for a post office site?
2. (a) If so, from whom was the same purchased, (b) what is the price paid or to be paid, (c) and where is the same located?
3. (a) Does the same lot of land contain any buildings? (b) If so, what will it cost to remove the same before commencing construction of the post office?
4. (a) Were any other lots offered to the Government for a site? (b) If so, who, at what price, (c) and did the Government take the same into consideration, (d) and on what grounds were they declined?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. A site is being acquired.
2. (a) From Mr. J. A. Kirkpatrick; (b) price to be paid, $1,500; (c) fronting on the Halifax and Truro road, opposite the I.R.C. station.
3. (a) Yes; (b) nothing, as the vendor is to remove the buildings at his own expense.
4. (a) Yes; (b) by Mr. W. N. Burris, for $6,500; (c) yes; (d) the departmental purchasing agent reported that he was unable to recommend the purchase of so costly a site.

DREDGE NO. 7.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. What was the cost of maintenance for dredge No. 7 for the calendar year 1914, and approximately for the fiscal year 1914-15?
2. How much was paid the Southern Salvage Company for attending the said dredge, supplying coal, etc.?
3. What are the main divisions and the amounts of the cost of maintenance, supplies, etc., of the said dredge No. 7 for the said calendar year or the said fiscal year?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $34,602.83.
2. $12,550.08.
3. Wages, $6,007.01; provisions, $1,834.98; fuel, $3,297.93; stores and equipment, $1,544.42; contingencies, $36.02; water, $167.85; wharfage, $124.84; rent of tugs, $8,085; repairs, $13,504.78; total, $34,602.83.

STEAMER COAST GUARD.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What was the amount paid the Southern Salvage Company of Liverpool, N.S., for its steamer Coast Guard in connection with dredging operations for the calendar year 1914?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $2,424.10.

JOHN T. DAGNEAU.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What position does John Dagneau,, of St. Omer, Bonaventure county, Quebec, occupy in the Inland Revenue Department service?

2. (a) When was he appointed, (b) at what salary, (c) and what is his present salary?
3. (a) What amount has been paid him since his appointment for salary, (b) and for travelling expenses (c) or other allowances?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. Mr. John T. Dagneau, assistant inspector of weights and measures.
2. (a) August 25, 1913. (b) $450. (c) $450.
3. (a) As salary $682.30. (b) No travelling expenses. (c) No other allowances.

WRECK OF STEAMER MONTMAGNY.

Mr. LACHANCE:

1. Is it true that the wreck of the steamer Montmagny lies at present opposite Ile aux Grues, in the river St. Lawrence, within a few yards of the channel generally followed by the ocean steamers?
2 .If so, does the Government propose to have that wreck removed at once?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The wreck is 600 feet distant from the axis of the channel, marked by the Hospital rock range lights. It is marked by a gas buoy, and therefore forms no obstruction to navigation.
3. The department will consider the question of removal when the wreck has been examined after the opening of navigation.

CHAMPLAIN MARKET STATION.

Mr. LACHANCE:

1. When was the work commenced for the construction of the Transcontinental railway station on the site of the Champlain market in Quebec?
2. When was such work suspended, and for what reason?

Mr. COCHRANE:

The following information has been furnished by the Chief Engineer of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission:

1. June 19, 1914.
2. December 20, 1914, for the reason that it was considered inadvisable to carry on the masonry and brick work during the severe winter weather.

REV. W. T. SUCKLING.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Does the Reverend W. T. Suckling hold the appointment of Champlain to the 14th King's Canadian Hussars?
2. Is it a fact that he has risen from the ranks, that he has taken an active interest in all matters pertaining to the militia, has he thoroughly qualified himself to instruct in musketry, and is reckoned one of the crack shots of Nova Scotia?
3. Has he volunteered for overseas service, and has he been recommended for the position of Chaplain to the 6th Canadian Mounted Rifles?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Yes.
2. No information.
3. Yes.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. OLIVER moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports or proceedings, and of all other documents relating to the purchase in Canada of horses for army service, by the British and French governments respectively.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This motion has been standing for some time. It is not considered best in the public interest to bring down a return such as is requested.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Can we know what is against the public interest in giving that information?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We will probably have some discussion on that question before we get through.

Mr. OLIVER: Yesterday the Minister of Public Works said that the Prime Minister would make a statement dealing with this question.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Very well; if that statement was made we can allow the motion to stand.

Motion stands.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Lachance: For a copy of all correspondence, calls for tenders and Orders in Council, relating to the deepening of the river St. Charles at the city of Quebec, and the construction of a dam at the same place.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

GOOD FRIDAY ADJOURNMENT.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved:

That when this House adjourns on Thursday the 1st of April, it stand adjourned until Saturday, the 3rd of April.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What about Monday, which is also a legal holiday?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is proposed that the House should sit on Monday.

Motion agreed to.

WAR SUPPLIES—AMMUNITION.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Major General HUGHES: I should just like to make a quotation from the report of the Chief of Ordnance to the Secretary of War of the United States Government for

the year 1914. On page 48 of the report the following figures are given with reference to ammunition manufactured by the United States Government:

The average total cost of rifle ammunition for the year was $26.24 per thousand, as compared with $27.08 per thousand for the preceding year; both costs being based on the same percentage to provide for the arsenal and War Department burdens. There was, however, an increase in the cost of material of 21 cents per thousand, so that the saving in the manufacturing over last year amounted to $1.11 per thousand, or a total saving of approximately $56,900. The average cost of the rifle ball cartridges procured from private manufacturers during the preceding year was $38.06 per thousand.

YUKON PLACER MINING ACT AMENDMENT.

Consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 67, to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—Mr. Roche.

Mr. ROCHE: The Senate has amended the Act to also include those who after enlistment are laid up through wounds or sickness. The Act, of course, is to protect those who have mining claims and have enlisted from having their claims cancelled during their absence.

Mr. KNOWLES: The same principle as to cancellations is involved in regard to homesteads as in regard to mining rights. What is the policy of the department as to the cancellation of homesteads at the present time?

Mr. ROCHE: Those who go to the front after enlisting will be protected. No cancellation will take place during the time they are on active service.

Mr. KNOWLES: With regard to cancellations generally, I have heard that no cancellations will be considered until the first of May.

Mr. ROCHE: There is a general protection up to the 1st of April for all homesteaders.

Amendment read the first and the second time and concurred in.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

TOBACCO, ETC., IN BOND.

On motion of Hon. P. E. Blondin (Minister of Inland Revenue), Bill No. 115, to amend the Inland Revenue Act, was read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

[Mr. Sam. Hughes.]

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS.

On motion of Hon. P. E. Blondin (Minister of Inland Revenue), the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Minister of Inland Revenue may authorize the employment of such temporary or acting officers of Excise in the second or outside division of the Department of Inland Revenue as are required to carry on the work of the department, that no such officer shall receive a higher salary than the salary allowed to permanent officers of the same rank and class, and no such salary shall be paid until voted by Parliament.

Mr. PROULX: Are these officers to do the ordinary work of the department or some new work?

Mr. BLONDIN: This amendment is in order to include in the Inland Revenue Act a clause similar to clause 6 of the Customs Act, regarding the appointment of temporary officials by Order in Council. In the past, and I am referring now to both the late Administration and the present, temporary officers were appointed by the Minister of Inland Revenue, under the impression that Clause 6 of the Customs Act also applied to Inland Revenue appointments. The attention of the department has been drawn to it by the Auditor General, and this is only to give authority to the department for what has been done in the past. It does not refer at all to any new employees; it refers only to the general employees, with whom the department is without power to-day to deal, and to the payment of whom the Auditor General would object in the future if this amendment were not provided.

Mr. PROULX: I would be afraid that the minister proposed to appoint an army of employees. A few days ago, when discussing his Estimates, he said that he intended to appoint some new employees to prevent the adulteration of maple syrup and sugar. I thought that perhaps this legislation was to provide for the appointment of these new employees.

Mr. BLONDIN: Not at all. As for the Bill passed yesterday, I think I gave a satisfactory explanation, I believe that both sides of the House were anxious that I should appoint as many employees as are necessary to see that the law is complied with.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If I understand the resolution properly, it is simply

to change the mode of appointing officers. Do I understand that officers are now appointed by Order in Council and that the object is to have them appointed by the minister?

Mr. BLONDIN: No. We have to employ temporary officers in the Inland Revenue Department just as they have to do in the Customs Department. If we need additional help we have to employ temporary officers, some for a month or two, or perhaps some for a year. Most of the officers appointed by the department have to be appointed temporarily in order that they may become used to the service, and after a time, if they prove themselves competent, they are appointed permanently. It was found by the Auditor General that under the present law we had no authority to employ temporary hands. That is the reason of the amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understood that the object was to have in the Inland Revenue Department the same law as prevails in the Customs Department. What is the law governing the Customs Department?

Mr. BLONDIN: We have no authority to make these appointments, although they have been made by the minister in the past. Section 6 of the Customs Act provides that:

> The minister may, from time to time, authorize the employment of such temporary or acting officers of custom in the second or outside division of the Department of Customs as are required to carry on the work of the department.
>
> 2. No such officer so employed shall receive a higher salary than he would be allowed if appointed permanently to the same rank and class; nor shall any such salary be paid until voted by Parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then what you are proposing is the same as this?

Mr. BLONDIN: Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will that include temporary clerks appointed at Ottawa?

Mr. BLONDIN: No, it only applies to temporary employees in the outside service.

Mr. PROULX: Are there many temporary employees in the department?

Mr. BLONDIN: There are not more than the usual number. I understand that there are between 200 and 300 temporary employees all over the Dominion.

Mr. PROULX: Are they employed all the year round or only for a few months?

Mr. BLONDIN: It depends on their employment. Most of them are employed all the year round.

Mr. BUREAU: What particular work are these temporary employees put at?

Mr. BLONDIN: They are employed in the different offices all over the country.

Mr. BUREAU: At what particular work?

Mr. BLONDIN: The usual work. As I explained a few moments ago, when at Montreal, Quebec or elsewhere, we take on new employees we always take them on temporarily, and after a while they may be appointed permanently.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand the minister to say that this is only the opening wedge to make men permanent? You say he employs them temporarily and then they are made permanent?

Mr. BLONDIN: No; that is not what I mean. Some of them, if their services are required and if they have been found duly qualified, will be appointed permanently. My hon. friend will understand that it is a great advantage to put a man on and test him before appointing him permanently.

Mr. PROULX: Does this amendment give the minister a means of evading the Civil Service Act?

Mr. BLONDIN: It only applies to the outside service. What we are asking Parliament to do is only to give the Inland Revenue Department the same right as it gave to the Customs Department. Clause 6 exists for the Customs Department but it does not exist for the Inland Revenue Department. In the past, the late Government appointed temporarily officials without any authority and it is to correct this condition that we are bringing in this legislation.

Mr. PROULX: Then these employees will not have to obtain a certificate from the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BLONDIN: They never have to in the outside service.

Mr. DEVLIN: Has the Auditor General paid these men up to the present?

Mr. BLONDIN: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What causes the question to arise now? Is it owing to the great number of men recently employed?

Mr. BLONDIN: I suppose some lawyer in the department has raised the question and it has been brought to my attention.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Department of the Auditor General is a progressive department, but it does not pretend to know everything all at once. It finds out that it has been making payments without proper authorization. It does not want to do wrong any more and it asks you to put it in a position to do right.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I notice that the Auditor General's Department has been progressing very well lately.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Do as we do—turn them out when they do wrong.

Mr. BUREAU: In what particular branch of the outside service are these employees required—weights and measures, gas and electricity inspection, selling stamps, or where?

Mr. BLONDIN: In every branch, mostly in the Excise Department.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any age limit for appointment to the outside service in the Inland Revenue Department?

Mr. BLONDIN: No.

Mr. MARCIL: You can appoint them as old as you like?

Mr. BUREAU: They appointed one 87 years old in Three Rivers.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You appointed one after he was dead.

Mr. BUREAU: You let them vote after they are dead.

Mr. MARCIL: When you appoint a man to the outside service do you require that he should qualify or pass an examination for the work that he is to do before you appoint him, or do you appoint him subject to the examination being passed later on?

Mr. BLONDIN: We appoint him subject to examination. We can appoint a man temporarily without an examination but in order to be permanent he has to undergo examination.

Mr. MARCIL: Do you allow him a certain time in which to qualify for his work?

Mr. BLONDIN: No. It all depends on the necessity of making a new permanent appointment for the work that is being done in his locality.

Mr. MARCIL: When you appoint a man and he turns out to be incompetent for the work for which he is appointed, do you keep him on or do you give him a specified time in which he must pass an examination to show his qualification for the work?

Mr. BLONDIN: When we want to make a new permanent appointment, the man is advised that he will have a certain time in which to pass his examination. If his services are not found to be satisfactory, all the department has to do is to turn him out.

Mr. MARCIL: In my constituency we have two employees in the Weights and Measures Branch. One ceased to be an employee, having been dismissed for political partisanship, and he has since become a member of the Quebec Legislature. The other was dismissed on the same ground after an investigation which lasted a couple of years. Three men were appointed to fill their places: one from Gaspé, Mr. Myles; one from Bonaventure, Mr. Dagneau; and one from Rimouski, Mr. Desjardins. Have those three men qualified for the work for which they were appointed, and are they still in the service of the department?

Mr. BLONDIN: They are still in the service of the department; they have not yet qualified for permanent positions.

Mr. MARCIL: Why was it necessary to appoint three men to fill two vacancies?

Mr. BLONDIN: Was the change made by me?

Mr. MARCIL: No, it was made by your predecessor.

Mr. BLONDIN: Would my hon. friend object to my taking some more time to look into the matter?

Mr. MARCIL: Certainly not.

Mr. KNOWLES: Appointments under this proposed legislation are undesirable, because it seems to enlarge the scope of appointments that are not under the guardianship of the Civil Service Commission. The whole trend of better public opinion at present is in the way of revolt against patronage. I say this without a partisan meaning, because both sides may more or less have erred in that regard. What rule does the minister apply to men who are taken on, and who have not over them the guardianship of the commission, in the way of protecting the country against partisans? The other day he laid it down as a principle that the gentleman next to him in position might indulge in free speech, and perhaps become offensive to

45 per cent of the people of Canada, by his abusive utterances against one of the great parties in Canada, but that the minister would in no way interfere with his freedom of speech. I am not going to revive the discussion in reference to the deputy minister, who was the subject of discussion; but as regards those men who are appointed entirely from political recommendations and who are not under the control of the commission, what is the minister's policy with regard to their indulging in controversial partisan disputes in the country, either at election time or at any other time?

Mr. BLONDIN: They have no right whatever to take an active part in politics. If any one of my officials should persist in such a course, I would have to dismiss him.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would the minister apply that principle to his deputy minister?

Mr. BLONDIN: That is another question which I would ask my hon. friend not to bring up on this resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM: One of the difficulties in the making of those temporary appointments is that a great number of officials are called temporary when they really are permanent, although, legally speaking, they are only temporary, because they have never been appointed to permanent positions. As soon as a Government changes, no matter what Government it is, pressure is brought to bear upon it to dispense with the services of such men, and it is said: why, such a man is only a temporary employee anyway; he has not a permanent position. Although he may have worked for ten years in the Government service he is still considered as a temporary employee. There ought to be some change in that respect. When a man or a woman has been in the employ of the Government for a certain length of time, that employee ought to become what is called permanent, so that dismissal could not occur without an Order in Council and without cause. Hundreds of so-called temporary employees are really permanent, although they are called temporary and subject to dismissal for reasons which do not apply to permanent employees. The Department of Customs, the Post Office Department and the Department of Inland Revenue are the departments that have the greatest number of temporary employees while the Department of Interior has also a great many. Such people may be employed for six weeks or for six years; but they have no protection against dismissal although they may be the best employees in in the Government.

Mr. BURNHAM: I should like to emphasize the remarks of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). There is a very singular case in Peterborough that illustrates the importance of what my hon. friend says. A fine old gentleman was appointed by the late Government to a position in Peterborough on the temporary list. That man cannot be turned out. He is over eighty years of age. He is ageing and he raises Cain with the customers. Application has been made by the collector to have him dismissed, but I said that I would not consent to have him dismissed. He comes of an excellent family that has survived the evils of Liberalism. The fact of the matter is that the man, if he were dismissed to-morrow, would be out on the street. He has been for many years in the service. If automatically he could have become a permanent clerk, he would be entitled to a retiring allowance; but as it is, he is not. It is impossible in the name of humanity to let that man go, but what are we to do? Is there no remedy for that sort of thing?

Mr. KNOWLES: Let us say that two men who are appointed under this proposed legislation show political partisanship and one of them displays partisanship in favour of the present Government, and the other in favour of the Liberals. Will the minister always use the two of them alike, and always adopt the policy that he has just annunciated? Will he fire a Tory for as little partisanship as he will a Grit?

Mr. BLONDIN: The minister is bound to follow the same line of policy towards all employees.

Mr. BUREAU: Will he do it?

Mr. BLONDIN: Certainly.

Mr. DEVLIN: Has the minister under this proposed legislation power to appoint any of these officers in the city of Hull, which adjoins Ottawa, but which is in another province?

Mr. BLONDIN: We have no other object in proposing this amendment than to correct an irregular procedure under the law.

Mr. DEVLIN: But the minister will have power to appoint Excise and Inland Revenue officers in the city of Hull under this legislation when it is passed?

Mr. BLONDIN: I am not informed that there is any necessity for such appointments.

Mr. DEVLIN: The city of Hull has over 20,000 population. It is true, it borders on the city of Ottawa, but it is divided from Ottawa by the Ottawa river. The minister can see the city of Hull even as he looks from Parliament Hill. It is a very important commercial city, perhaps the greatest manufacturing city along certain lines in the Dominion of Canada. It would be a great convenience to the city of Hull to have these officers appointed. Just prior to going out of power the late Government opened a customs office in Hull, and that office yields great profit to the Government and is of immense advantage to the surrounding section of country. This proposed law will give the Minister of Inland Revenue power to appoint similar officers for his department in the city of Hull, and I ask him if he will not appoint some of these officers for the good of the public service and the general convenience of the people?

Mr. BLONDIN: I will give the remarks of my hon. friend all consideration, and if there is necessity I will make the appointments.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am a little surprised at my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin).

Mr. DEVLIN: Surprised?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, that he would put temptation in the way of the Minister of Inland Revenue and urge it upon him. The minister's answer was that if there were no necessity there would be no appointments. Now the hon. gentleman is trying to induce the minister to appoint officers in Hull simply because Hull can be seen from Ottawa and is the largest manufacturing city in the world. Surely he cannot wish officers appointed, even in Hull, if there is no necessity for them.

Mr. DEVLIN: Perhaps my language was not clear to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I was speaking non-politically.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As usual.

Mr. DEVLIN: I try to speak non-politically. I was pointing out the importance of the city of Hull and its peculiar situation. Although it is near the city of Ottawa it serves a portion of the country which cannot be conveniently served by the officers in Ottawa city. There was formerly necessity for opening a customs office there, and there is the same necessity for opening an Inland Revenue office. I would not ask the Government to spend a dollar where there is no necessity. I am only sorry the Government is in the habit of spending money where there is no necessity.

Mr. PROULX: I do not understand this measure. Does it mean that the minister is getting power to pay yearly salaries to men who are employed only a few months in the year?

Mr. BLONDIN: No, I am only asking that a privilege enjoyed by every other department of the Government should be extended to the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. PROULX: The resolution says: "No such officer shall receive a higher salary than the salary paid to permanent officers of the same rank and class." Would not that put them in the same rank as the permanent employees?

Mr. BLONDIN: No. It means that they cannot be appointed at a higher salary than that of the permanent officers whom they may be called upon to replace temporarily.

Mr. PROULX: But if the minister already has the power to employ temporary employees what does he need this for?

Mr. BLONDIN: I have not the power, while other departments have.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Does this give the minister any power that he has not previously exercised? I understand not.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Up to this time certain appointments have been made, but the Auditor General has notified the minister and the department that this is not legal and that he cannot any longer pay for that kind of appointment, and that if these officers are to be paid, authority of law must be procured. And I understand the minister is getting the authority under this Bill.

12 noon.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before asking for this legislation the minister ought to furnish the committee with the memorandum from the Auditor General.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Surely, the hon. gentleman is going very far. The responsible minister has risen in his place and

stated his reason for proposing this Bill, and that reason is that he has been notified by the Auditor General that this kind of appointment cannot any longer be paid for. Now the hon. gentleman says that before the Bill passes the minister should bring the proof. I do not think he should say that to a minister of the Crown.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think that is asking too much. The Department of Inland Revenue has been in operation since Confederation—for nearly fifty years. The minister tells us that temporary employees have been appointed from time to time during all that period and no objection has been raised. Now, I cannot think it possible that that has been done contrary to the law. I cannot imagine for a moment that that is the cause of asking for this legislation. It is no reflection upon the judgment of the minister to ask that the memorandum of the Auditor General should be produced. It would be very interesting to the House to know how it comes that this which has been going on for fifty years is now found to be objectionable under the law. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) must forgive me if I am a little suspicious as to the reason for this. We know that when this Government first came into office they wanted to get rid of the commissioners engaged for the construction of the National Transcontinental railway. They did not like to dismiss them, but they passed a law reducing the number of commissioners to one. I remember that in New Brunswick, not long ago, the Government there wanted to get rid of a very valued official. They did not like to dismiss him—to do so would have offended the public very much. But they passed a law fixing an age limit which was just such as to exclude this man, and so he was removed from office by legislation. Now the Minister of Inland Revenue, perhaps, wants to dismiss a lot of temporary employees.

Mr. BLONDIN: Not at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He wants to declare that they are not legally appointed, and he wants power to make legal appointments. That is, he can quietly let these employees retire from office without incurring the odium of making dismissals. If called upon later to justify this act, he could say, and say truthfully, that Parliament had declared that these gentlemen engaged in temporary work were not legally appointed and therefore were not in the employ of the Government at all. He could say: I did not dismiss them; they passed naturally out of the Government's employ, and I have appointed new officers under the authority Parliament has given me. The hon. gentleman will forgive me, if, in the light of what has taken place in the three years since this Government took office, we on this side, at least I—and I only speak for myself—am a little suspicious as to the reason for the passing of this Bill.

M. BLONDIN: I shall be pleased to give a copy of the memorandum to my hon. friend. He asks under what authority the department has been proceeding for years. The Auditor General did not refer particularly to the present; he referred to the condition under the late Government as well. We are simply making a provision similar to that which applies to the Customs Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister will produce that memorandum?

Mr. BLONDIN: Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: What is the classification of the officials of the Inland Revenue Department?

Mr. BLONDIN: There are four classes: special excisemen and first, second and third-class excisemen.

Mr. DEVLIN: Are all the officers of the second division in the outside service?

Mr. BLONDIN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister stated a few moments ago that temporary employees should not receive higher salaries than the officials whom they replace. Are these temporary employees appointed simply to replace other officials, or in addition to the regular permanent staff of the department?

Mr. BLONDIN: These temporary officers are employed only when required. The intent of this proposed legislation is to provide for the appointment of temporary employees, who are paid only very small salaries.

Mr. BUREAU: Are they to be appointed only when certain permanent officials are ill or on leave of absence, or are they to be appointed in addition to the regular staff?

Mr. BLONDIN: Most of these temporary officials are employed when the work increases to such an extent that their services are necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Under a provision of the Inland Revenue Act, temporary employees may be appointed by Order in Council. I quote section 12:

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, appoint officers and other persons to carry out this Act and all other Acts relative to the matters and things placed under the control and management of the department, and also all Orders in Council or regulations made thereunder, and the Governor in Council may assign the names of office of such officers and persons, and grant them such salaries or pay for their labour and responsibility as he deems reasonable and necessary, and may appoint the times and manner in which the same shall be paid; but no such officer or person shall receive a higher annual salary than is allowed in his case by the Civil Service Act.

It is clear, therefore, that the Governor in Council has at the present time power to appoint permanent or temporary officers all over the Dominion to positions in the outside service as well as in the inside service. My hon. friend is trying to-day, for some reason which he has not fully explained to the committee, to take that power out of the hands of the Governor in Council and to place it in the hands of the minister. Is that in the public interest? Is there any reason for it? What is to hinder the minister from making his recommendations to council in respect of the appointment of temporary or permanent officers throughout the Dominion, as has been the custom for the last fifty years?

Mr. BLONDIN: The only answer I can give my hon. friend is that we are asking only for such power as is given to the other departments.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the minister not agree with me that the Governor in Council, on his recommendation, may, under section 12 of the Act which I have just read, appoint temporary officers for work in any part of Canada?

Mr. BLONDIN: I do not see why my hon. friend should wish to deprive my department of a privilege which it was deemed wise to extend to the other departments of Government. That is the only answer that I can give.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps the necessity for it has not been felt in my hon. friend's department.

Resolution reported, read the first and the second time and concurred in, and referred to Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 116, to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

Bill No. 116, to amend the Inland Revenue Act, founded on the above resolution, read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, together with the resolution reported this day, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1—employment of temporary officers:

Mr. BLONDIN: I am informed that there is no possibility of hiring temporary help without passing this measure. I shall have all the details before the third reading.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me absurd to say that under the section of the existing Act which I have read the Governor in Council has not power to appoint men of the class provided for in the amendment.

Mr. BLONDIN: I shall have all the information from my department.

Bill reported.

SOLDIERS' VOTING BILL.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Sévigny in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to make provision to enable every male British subject of twenty-one years of age or upwards serving in the military forces of Canada in the present war, to exercice his electoral franchise, and that the cost incurred in carrying out the provisions of any Act to be based upon this resolution may be paid by the Governor in Council out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Bill to be based upon this resolution makes provision whereby men engaged in the active military service of the country may be enabled to vote in the event of an election occurring while they are still on such service. The Bill in addition provides a method whereby they may be enabled to exercise that franchise. It occurred to me that possibly it might meet the general convenience if the discussion was had on the Bill itself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Bill is of a very extraordinary nature, but I would not care to offer an opinion on it until I had seen its provisions. Therefore, we shall let the resolution pass.

Resolution reported, read the first and the second time and concurred in.

Mr. Doherty thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 111, to enable Canadians on active military service during

the present war to exercise their electoral franchise.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

VANCOUVER HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the Order being called:

House in Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners Act by providing that the corporation may make by-laws for the imposition of tolls, rates, fees and dues, other than pilotage dues, sick mariners' dues and steamboat inspectors' fees, and that all tolls, rates, fees, dues and other revenue levied or collected by the corporation under the authority of the said Act, shall be paid to, and be retained by the corporation, and form part of its general revenue.—Mr. Hazen.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I had this Order called, as the Minister of Marine informs me that he was not prepared to go on with it and it may be dropped.

Order dropped.

GOLD AND SILVER MARKING ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir George Foster, Bill No. 113, to amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1—offences made punishable on summary conviction, and minimum penalties added:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The purpose of this amendment is simply to provide better means for the enforcing of the Act. There is no change at all in any of the provisions of the Bill. In the first place the amendment is to provide that one who violates the Act shall be liable to summary conviction. Before, it was merely an indictable offence. This makes the procedure more simple and enables prosecutions to be made before the magistrate. Up to the present the supervisor or superintendent of the Act has had great difficulty in enforcing it on account of the delays that took place. The amendment also asks that the minimum fine be $25. The maximum is already fixed at $100. It also provides that the articles in regard to which a conviction is obtained under the Act shall be confiscated to the Crown. This conforms to the legislation in the Customs Act and the Criminal Code. Another amendment makes it possible for the inspector to seize articles which he believes are in contravention of the Act, and to hold the same until the case is disposed of. Hitherto all he was able to do was to make an inspection and report, and then before the courts could take the matter up the articles would mysteriously disappear and the evidence was gone.

Mr. KNOWLES: Could this summary conviction be had before an ordinary justice of the peace?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think so.

Mr. KNOWLES: In our part of the country we are very far away from any inspector. I have in mind a certain case where a more or less unprincipled jeweller came into the town and imposed upon the people very much. He carried on business quite a long time, selling watches and other things, and made a great deal of money. I remember being waited on by a deputation of the permanent jewellers, but the trouble seemed to be to get any inspector, and it occurred to me then whether the inspectors are conveniently situated geographically. I should like to ask the minister about that.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When the Act came into force one inspector was appointed, and he does the work for the whole Dominion. He makes periodical trips through different parts of the country, and if there are any cases such as my hon. friend has mentioned he is informed about it. However, it is not necessary for him to be in any particular place in order to enable proceedings to be taken. This Act has been in force only a short time and has worked well, although the machinery for proper prosecution has been inefficient. In some cases offences against the Act have been thoroughly dealt with, but in more cases there was such delay and difficulty in getting evidence that the prosecutions did not turn out satisfactorily. There is probably more need of these amendments and of a better enforcement of the Act at present than heretofore, because the conditions of the country are such as rather to place a premium on the sale of cheap goods, and many people are being grossly imposed upon. They think they are getting fairly good jewellery, when really they are getting nothing but pinchbeck. The department proposes to see that the Act is enforced and, providing the expense is not too great, the proper machinery will be added as it becomes necessary.

Mr. KNOWLES: The clause says "who being a dealer." Would that apply to a

clerk? Lots of these people give themselves fancy names, such as the New York Watch Company or the New York Watch Agency.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Act defines a dealer as "any person who is a manufacturer of, or seller of, or dealer in," whether wholesale or retail.

Mr. KNOWLES: It would not apply to clerks?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It would take in any person who sells. But I suppose that a company or firm is responsible for what its employees do.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

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

Department of Indian Affairs—Indians of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories—to provide a further amount for seed grain, $18,941; to provide a further amount for relief of destitute Indians, $20,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: What is the particular cause that has led up to the granting of this relief for destitute Indians? There are very few Indians in that part of Saskatchewan where they had a crop failure. There must be some other cause than the failure of crop. I would like some information on the point.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of Interior): This includes the Northwest, but it has largely to do with the outlying Indians. The information I have is that the outbreak of hostilities in Europe has affected the Indians to a considerable extent. The war has interfered with the fur trade, the European market for furs has disappeared for the time being, and the Indians' source of supplies has almost vanished, as they have no market for their furs and cannot get goods in trade for them, as the fur-traders will not accept the furs or make advances to the Indians in the form of supplies to enable them to go to their hunting grounds. The Indians are advised to hunt for food, and many are doing so, but nevertheless they have to be assisted. The department, through trading companies and the Northwest Mounted Police, have organized a system of relief for Indians requiring assistance, and as the vote for such requirements under normal circumstances is proving inadequate to meet the demand under the changed conditions, a supplementary grant becomes necessary.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. OLIVER: What particular localities are likely to receive assistance under this grant?

Mr. ROCHE: It is in the outlying and extreme northerly portions of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Mr. OLIVER: There are no agents in these outlying districts. By what means is the relief to be distributed?

Mr. ROCHE: It is distributed largely through orders of the missionaries.

Mr. OLIVER: Do I understand that it is distributed entirely on the orders of the missionaries, or is there a division of authority?

Mr. ROCHE: It will also be distributed through the Northwest Mounted Police where there are mounted police.

Mr. OLIVER: Either through the mounted police or the missionaries?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: It does not rest with the trading companies?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there any destitution among the Indians of St. Peter's reserve?

Mr. ROCHE: There has been nothing reported to the department. They are doing pretty well, I understand. They have had smallpox there.

Mr. OLIVER: I understand that some days ago an opportunity was taken, while discussing the affairs of the Indian Department, to place before the House certain statements in regard to a transaction in relation to the St. Peter's Indian reserve, which was intended to be a reflection upon the administration of the Indian Department, and a criticism of the transaction by which the surrender of this reserve was secured.

I am sorry I was not present at the time, but I do not think it would be fair to the House or to the country to allow the opportunity to pass without placing before the House in as short a form as possible the present position in regard to this reserve. There is a somewhat complicated series of accusations. One is that the Indians were not properly treated by the Government. In regard to that, I can only say that a treaty was made with the Indians for the surrender of the reserve. They were paid in accordance with the usual practice as to treaty payments, and over and above the price

that they received for the reserve, they received in exchange another reserve of greater area and better adapted to their requirements. Therefore the Indians were not mistreated in the transactions between them and the Government.

In regard to the attitude of the department and the circumstances of the surrender; the surrender was taken as other surrenders in Canada have been taken up to the present time. The vote of the majority of the band present decided in favour of the surrender, and in accordance with that vote the surrender was made. After the surrender had been made, after the arrangements had been made for transferring the Indians to the new reserve, the Government of Manitoba stepped in and refused to register under the Land Titles Act of that province the transfers of land from the Indians to the parties who had bought from them. From that time to the present those transfers have not been registered, the responsibility being upon the Government of the province of Manitoba. The Government of the Dominion of Canada had bought the land from the Indians; it had paid the Indians for the land; the transaction was absolutely in accordance with the practice relating to such transactions in the past, and there was no reason or ground for the action of the Government of the province of Manitoba except a desire and intent to use not its right but its power as a means of blackmailing the purchasers of those lands. The Government of Manitoba saw fit to appoint a commission to inquire into the validity of the transaction on the part of the Dominion Government. That inquiry could have no possible effect except as an academic inquiry; but the commission made the inquiry, and the result of it was a finding that the transaction had been regular throughout, except that one part of the commission held the belief that the vote of the Indians for the surrender should have been a vote of an actual majority of the band and not a vote of the majority of those present.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE: Which commission was that?

Mr. OLIVER: A commission appointed by the Government of the province of Manitoba. I do not know which commission; but there was a commission appointed that brought in that report.

As regards the validity of the surrender, if the vote of a majority of the band is necessary to a surrender, there has been no surrender taken from the Indians in Canada which would be valid under that ruling; or if there is such a one, it is an exception. Therefore, if the suggestion that the surrender was illegal is correct, then the titles of land bought from Indian reserves throughout the Dominion of Canada are to-day invalid. Any one knows that if such a condition does exist, this Parliament will of necessity have to pass an Act validating those titles. Therefore there is no foundation in any way, shape or manner for the Government of Manitoba refusing the transfers, except as a means of enforcing blackmail upon the purchasers of those lands.

Without going into details, I may say that the position of this reserve was peculiar in many respects, and that it was necessary to make special arrangements in order to secure a surrender. Many unsuccessful attempts had been made to secure that surrender in times past. We made a further attempt and we were successful. It was believed that, although the terms granted to the Indians were extraordinary—and there is no doubt that they were extraordinary—it was in the interest both of the Indians and of the people who lived in that part of the province of Manitoba that the surrender should be secured and that the Indians should be removed to another reserve. Owing to the action of the Government of that province, owing to the suggestions that have been made to the Indians that under this, that, or the other set of circumstances they would be able to secure a larger payment for their land, all of them have not yet removed to this new reserve, and the reserve is to-day in very much the same position as it was when the surrender took place, the Indians being in a position that is entirely contrary to their welfare, and the surrounding locality including the town of Selkirk, is suffering very seriously and having its development retarded because of the failure of that surrender to be carried out.

On that point I have some information which I wish to place before the House, seeing that the matter has already been before us in so many ways.

I have here a copy of the Selkirk Weekly Record, a Conservative newspaper published in the town of Selkirk. This is the issue of January 22, and I will read from it a short article on the subject of this St. Peter's Indian Reserve:

St. Peter's and Selkirk.

The Record has repeatedly expressed its views on the above subject so vital to this district as

a whole, and to Selkirk in particular. For eight years the validity of the surrender of the reserve has been made a political football by both the Liberal and Conservative parties, to the material disadvantage of Selkirk and surrounding country. And the game goes merrily on with apparently no end in sight. Selfish political manipulators, without regard for justice to the territory affected, have through one pretext or another prevented settlement, and this district has suffered with marked patience.

To-day the reserve question is the most important from a material standpoint this community has to consider. Are we to submit indefinitely to the political jugglery which is crippling Selkirk's industrial opportunities, and preventing the development of about 50,000 acres of fertile land? Without regard to political affiliation, it is safe to say ninety per cent of the electors of this district deprecate the deplorable injustice of the methods employed to prevent an equitable adjustment of the matter, and earnestly desire the settlement many years overdue. This sentiment has long been disregarded, and the people have suffered with much patience. In the interest of decency, justice to the Indians, purchasers and the district there should be no further delay in fully, and finally passing upon the points at issue relative to the surrender.

These lands were sold at auction by the government and privately by the Indians in accordance with the terms of the surrender. Final payments on the auction lands were made three years since, at which time the Dominion Government was under moral and legal obligations to issue patents. The purchasers have complied with their obligations to the government and as a reward their interests and the interests of the district have been permitted to suffer in the game of politics.

The Record is heartily in sympathy with the Government jealous in protecting the interests of its wards, but not to the manifold detriment of a large territory and conscientious purchasers. Assuming there are instances in which the Indian was unscrupulously dealt with, there is ample opportunity for redress other than throttling the development of this district by further manipulation of the surrender.

It is high time for the citizens of Selkirk and surrounding territory to unitedly demand immediate and decisive action on this question. We believe we voice the sentiment of practically every resident of the district who has given this question unbiased consideration. The surrender will receive further attention in these columns from time to time with the hope that an imperial presentation of the facts will tend to bring about an equitable settlement.

At one o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER: When the committee rose at one o'clock, I was reading an extract from the Selkirk Record of January 22, dealing with the subject of the St. Peter's Reserve. I wish to read another article on the same subject from the Record of January 29. It is headed: "St. Peter's Reserve Question," and is as follows:

[Mr. Oliver.]

The public of this town and district are anxious to know what developments there are in the St. Peter's Reserve case. Several months ago it was officially stated that an action to annul the surrender had been commenced; that the writs were being served, and in twenty days the case would be brought to trial. From information that we have gathered as to this latest phase of the question we are forced to conclude that this announcement was deliberately made to deceive the public. There are over six hundred defendants in the action, all of whom must be served. Each defendant has four weeks from the time he is served to reply. The trial can, therefore, not be reached until the last defendant has been served, and he has had time to reply. We leave it to our readers to figure out, from their knowledge of the speed with which our courts proceed when judgment may be expected.

To the authorities we would say: Stop playing with this question. Confirm the titles. The Indians are satisfied. While they realize that some of them made improvident sales, still the surrender contract was to them highly satisfactory and beneficial. The moral and material advantages that followed the removal of the Indians from the old St. Peter's Reserve have far outweighed any wrong that the Indians may have sustained at the hands of unscrupulous land buyers. It is a well-known fact that Indians and half-breeds are prone to make improvident bargains, and quite frequently get the worst of the deal, and it may be taken for granted that many of the sales made by the St. Peter's Indians were no exception to the rule. Even if such were the case the cancellation of the surrender would instead of righting a wrong, result in a far greater wrong against many who are guilty of no wrong-doing.

The government would be rendering far greater assistance to the Indians if it would engage counsel, for those that have been cheated by individual buyers, to prosecute their case before the court of the province. It is now almost eight years since the surrender was taken. Does the Government now propose to give us another eight years of litigation? The public is long suffering, but the limit has been reached.

I read from the Record of February 5:

It is safe to say that at least seventy-five per cent of the members of the St. Peter's Band of Indians wish the surrender to be confirmed. They realize that they made a good bargain with the Government and received very liberal treatment at its hands. A number of Indians have disposed of their lands at prices satisfactory to them but have not received payment in full because of the unsettled state of affairs now existing, and are suffering for the lack of these funds. The Government owes these a duty to ratify the surrender.

The present reserve is much more suitable for the purposes of the band than the St. Peter's Reserve, because the more isolated they are the easier it is for the chief and council and parents to control and guide the younger generation, and the evils which very often follow the intermingling of whites and Indians are correspondingly decreased.

Many fathers when voting for the surrender did so, no doubt, solely for the reason that they wished to get their children away from

the vicinity of the liquor traffic, and to avoid if possible the debauchery which so often follows in its trail, and because they hoped that the moral atmosphere of the new reserve would be more healthful than that of St. Peter's. This, we think, all will admit, is an important factor in the future welfare of the band. Are these fathers not entitled to as much consideration at the hands of the Government as some few members of the band, who imbibed too much whisky and then sold their lands for a song? The duty of the Government to its wards is as a strong in moral matters as in material, if not stronger.

If then the majority of the band wish to remain where they are and to have the surrender confirmed, why should the Government compel them, against their will and judgment, and to their decided disadvantage, to come back to St. Peters?

As has been pointed out in these columns cancellation of the surrender might benefit a few individuals, but would harm a vastly greater number.

In the same issue, under the heading: "Public Meeting Needed," I find the following:

The most important question now being discussed in Selkirk, next to the war, is the settlement of the St. Peter's land dispute. It is felt that the time has arrived for united action on the part of our citizens in demanding a speedy settlement of this long delayed matter, and it has been suggested that the Selkirk board of trade call a public meeting at an early date to discuss this question. The idea is a good one, and The Record hopes it will be carried out. The St. Peter's reserve question has too long been used as a political football to the detriment of our town, and it is high time our citizens made a vigorous protest. The Dominion Parliament is in session, and if a public meeting was held and a strong resolution passed, irrespective of politics, pointing out the great loss sustained by Selkirk, financially and otherwise, owing to the long delay in settlement, and a copy of such resolution forwarded to Premier Borden, some good might be accomplished. Since the surrender of the reserve, time and again we have been told that the matter in reference to the lands would be quickly settled, but the years have come and the years have gone and nothing has yet been done. Is it any wonder that the patience of our citizens is getting exhausted? The whole matter could be equitably adjusted in a short time if politics were not allowed to intervene. This question is not a political one, but a local one of vital interest to the welfare and progress of the town of Selkirk and district, and in this light it should be considered by the government. If any of the Indians have been defrauded there is a remedy. but justice should also be done to those who purchased the lands in good faith and have been deprived of their titles for years. Owing to the non-settlement of this question, some of the best land in the district has been lying idle for years, which, if a settlement had been made, would now have been occupied by good settlers and the town and district greatly benefited. By all means let a public meeting be called, and some definite action taken in an endeavour to have this hindrance to the prosperity and development of our town speedily removed.

Hon. gentlemen will observe that in the article that I have just read, the Record called for a public meeting and asked the Board of Trade to take action. The Record of February 12, under the heading: "Board of Trade, Annual Meeting," has the following:

The annual meeting of the Selkirk Board of Trade was held in the town hall on Thursday evening, February 4th. The report of the retiring council, presented by the President, F. A. Gemmel, dealt with the many matters that had come before the board during the past year, and concluded with a vigorous statement of the Board's portion with respect to the dilatory St. Peter's embroglio, and an arraignment of the political tactics that had held up the settlement for eight years, "eight years" in the language of the report, "of Western Canada's greatest development", eight years lost to Selkirk forever."

Before the annual meeting adjourned, a motion offered by mayor Ross and seconded by Bruce Campbell, was unanimously passed, congratulating The Selkirk Record upon the vigorous and praiseworthy stand it has lately taken upon the St. Peter's question.

There is another article in this issue of the Record that I desire to read. I said that the Record is a Conservative paper. It is not and never was a Liberal paper; it is essentially and always has been a Conservative paper. In the article I am about to read it finds it desirable, in pursuance of its belief that nothing good can come from the Liberal side, to call in question the actions of the Liberal Government and myself, so that I think it is fair that the House should have the benefit of all that the paper has said on the subject, whether it reflects on the Liberal Government and myself or not. The article is a retort to an article appearing in the Manitoba Free Press:

Playing Politics.

The Fress Press convicts the premier, and Mr. Bradbury of "playing politics" on the St. Peter's question.

That refers to the Premier of Manitoba.

The public know the facts. It is up to them now, but what about the Hon. Frank Oliver, who had most to do with this matter? Was he not warned by competent solicitors that there was a legal question demanding the attention of the Government as to whether the statutes required only a majority of the votes of the male members of a band over 21 years at the meeting, or whether it required a majority of all the male members of the band over 21 years of age? His reply was that the St. Peter's Reserve was surrendered the same as all other reserves in Canada, and while this statement stands undisputed it is not a sufficient answer, and leaves a shadow not only on the titles of St. Peter's Reserve, but all other surrendered Indians in reserves in Canada. This was made very plain to him, and he was earnestly entreated to remove this possible technicality, and not hand out the title with a shadow or pos-

sible question mark on it But no, he and his party, must be sustained, and instead of giving the relief asked for he proceeded to "play politics," and so the game goes on back, and forth while the interests of Selkirk and district are ground to dust under the feet of politicians. Now we are told with all seriousness that the case is in court. What is there to try? Nothing but the legal quibble just referred to that is common to all surrenders.

Newspapers and politicians may talk glibly with this surrender, but they are just "playing about fraud, and make sinister expressions about the dock doings in connection with this surrender, but they are just "playing politics," and they know it. Ask any of the solicitors who appeared before the St. Peter's Commission which sat so long in Selkirk, and they will tell you, unless they too "play politics," that with this quibble removed, there is not a leg for this long drawn out St. Peter's question to stand on.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is the hon. member reading from an editorial?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is he aware that an editor is paid to write upon one side as a lawyer is paid to advocate one side, and that he can sit down with a clear conscience and write absolutely contrary to what he thinks? As a matter of fact, there is no basis whatever for an argument in this case.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the hon. member a member of the legal profession?

Mr. BURNHAM: I am.

Mr. OLIVER: Then he—

Mr. BURNHAM: I was also an editor.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh, well, that settles it.

Mr. BURNHAM: I know what I am talking about.

Mr. GRAHAM: He has both disqualifications.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. gentleman in making this suggestion speaks whereof he knows—and we will accept him at his own valuation. I wish to point out that this is not a question of what the editor thought, this is a question as to what the facts are; and whether the editor who wrote that was paid or not, the statement that he makes is or is not true irrespective of what he thought. The verity of his statement does not rest on his unsupported statement; he has the formal endorsation of the Selkirk Board of Trade for the position he has taken and the arguments that he has used.

Mr. BRADBURY: What authority has the Selkirk Board of Trade?

[Mr. Oliver]

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend knows better than I do what weight to attach to the opinion of the Board of Trade of Selkirk. The article continues:

If there is a blunder, who made it but the Government, and if the Government should succeed, after keeping the land and Selkirk and district tied up ten or fifteen years, in breaking this surrender over this question, which is their own error, what will it mean? It will mean they have wronged innocent buyers out of the property they were justly, and honorably entitled. To illustrate: Nearly one-half of the reserve was sold at Government auction sale, and citizens of Canada, relying upon the good faith of their Government, bought this land and the last of their money was paid to the Government years ago, both the Liberal and Conservative governments receiving these funds, and long after this question of the legality of the surrender had been fully discussed. Not only have they received these funds, but year after year with the greatest deliberation have paid them over to the Indians. Now with the overshadowing power of the government, and the strong arm of the law they purpose to wrest these lands from these buyers. And why? Simply in the interest of this great "game of politics."

Fellow-citizens of Selkirk, we have stood quietly by in the shadow during about a decade of great progress and opportunity while this game was being played. Just following the close of the present war will doubtless be another era of great opportunity. The court proceedings will probably carry us safely past this, when our griping, and disappointments will be less keen because the spur of opportunity will again be gone. Then the government may win, and bring the Indians back, and then the politicians may be good enough to play this great game all over again. Inspiring, is it not?

My friend from Peterborough and my friend from Selkirk have both made suggestions to discredit the writer of the article.

Mr. BURNHAM: I did not.

Mr. OLIVER: I am glad to give my hon. friend the opportunity to make any further explanation he pleases; but my understanding was that he desired to discredit the writer of the article.

Mr. BURNHAM: Not the writer. A man may be a very eminent writer or a very eminent counsel and a very truthful, honourable man and yet fulfil the requirements of his brief and argue accordingly. I am making no imputation whatever against the writer, I am arguing against the credibility of his editorial and the hon. member is trying to back up the editorial by the personality of the writer.

Mr. OLIVER: No, I am not trying to back it up by the personality of the writer, I am backing up the editorial by the fact that the writer is present in the place, cognizant of the facts and dependent upon public opinion

for his continuance in business in that locality.

Mr. BRADBURY: Does the hon. gentleman know the writer of the article?

Mr. OLIVER: No, I do not know who wrote the article, but I know the editor of the Record and have known him since he was a boy and I think that both the man himself and his family connections will compare favourably with those of any ordinary citizen or even with any member of this House in regard to standing and credibility. However, that is not the point I wish to make. The point is that the man who is on the ground and directly responsible to the people living in that locality for his continuance in business makes these statements and uses these arguments, and is supported in doing so by the Board of Trade of the town, and further supported by a public meeting, a report of which I will read to the House. I quote from the Winnipeg Free Press of March 30, 1915:

Fully 250 citizens of Selkirk and adjoining municipalities attended a public meeting held last evening in Pearson's hall to consider the situation with respect to the St. Peter's Indian reserve surrender.

It was the largest meeting ever held in Selkirk and for once in the history of the town all differences and dissentions, political and otherwise were sunk in order that one unanimous, supreme effort might be made to induce the government at Ottawa to confirm the surrender and issue titles for the lands purchased from the Indians by private individuals.

J. H. Grisdale president, and speeches strongly condemnatory of the manner in which the matter had been treated by politicians for party purposes were made by Dr. Ross, mayor of Selkirk; Bruce Campbell, secretary of the board of trade; George Frank, reeve of St. Clement's; Councillor Harriott, of St. Andrew's; D. Morrison, Selkirk; Arthur Clair, St. Andrew's; F. A. Campbell Selkirk; G. T. Blakert, president of the board of trade; Ex-Councillor Muckle, St. Andrew's; and B. E. Benson.

Mr. BRADBURY: All first-class Grits.

Mr. OLIVER: It goes on:

All the speakers were enthuiastically applauded.

Mr. Benson moved the following resolution, which was seconded by F. W. Hooker, and carried without a dissenting voice with great enthusiasm:

"That this public meeting of the citizens of Selkirk and district, assembled without personal interest or political affiliation, actuated by the acute realization of the great injury that has been and is still being done in the district through the non-settlement of the St. Peter's reserve surrender over a period of eight years;

"Hereby resolve, that as a body representative of the entire community and district, we are firmly convinced that the common injury and injustice being wrought by the hold-up of these lands from occupation, has created a situation, the continuance of which would be intolerable.

"Further, that the Indians, as a body, are and have always been, satisfied with the surrender and its terms;—

Mr. BRADBURY: That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend can settle that with the 250 of his constituents who supported this resolution. It goes on:

—and finally, as the only solution of the present deadlock without still further delay, loss and expense, we hereby demand of the Government the confirmation of the surrender and the immediate issuance of titles to the lands."

The meeting was closed with a vote of thanks for the chairman and the singing of the national anthem.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman was not there, then.

Mr. OLIVER: Why does my hon. friend make that remark?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I simply said you were not there.

Mr. OLIVER: Did my hon. friend say it because he wishes to be insulting, or because he is silly.

Mr. BENNETT: I would not for a single moment be insulting, and as to being silly, well, one might really get into the hon. member's class.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend will be well advised not to make such remarks when they are not called for.

Mr. BENNETT: I thought they were.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend will remember that he is not in Calgary in Al Hazar hall.

Mr. BENNETT: I think that is a Turkish name, and that they changed it since the war began. I think they call it Belshazzar now.

Mr. OLIVER: I have given the opinion of the newspaper published in the locality which is affected by this transaction, and where live the people who are best informed as to the merits of this transaction. I have given the opinion of the Board of Trade as to this transaction, and I have given the opinion of a public meeting at which their representative men were present. I desire now to give the opinion of the official of the Indian Department in regard to one side of the merits of this transaction. My hon. friend from Selkirk

(Mr. Bradbury), who has taken a very deep interest in the matter of the surrender of the reserve, has from time to time laid great stress upon the injustice that was done the Indians in this transaction. That injustice was in paying them for the land that they had, and giving them in the place of it a greater area of better land. My hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) shakes his head. He is inclined to deny the latter part of my statement. I propose to read to him the opinion of the Indian agent as to the benefit to the Indians of their removal to the new reserve. In the annual report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1914, he says:

> The movement of the people from St. Peter's continues, it has not been as rapid as I hoped it would be. Those who are still in residenec at St. Peter's have been advised that the time for receiving assistance from the department for moving and building has about expired, and it has been pointed out to them that the advantage gained in this way is too valuable for them to run any risk of losing it; there is now a pretty definite intention to move, one or two of the leaders have gone, and I hope to see many others arrange to do so during the coming season. Arrangements have been made to assist them in building, when they arrive at Peguis; a sufficient quantity of lumber and other building material has been placed there with Agent Carter, during the past winter, to meet any demands made for this purpose. It is realized by them that they will be acting in their own best interest, if they move, as they find that those who have moved are doing well at Peguis.

I think I may rest the case there for the present. We now have the evidence as to the benefit the white people derive from the taking of this surrender, and it is given by those who are in a measure entitled to speak for the white people. We also have the evidence of the officers of the department as to the benefit to the Indians of their taking advantage of the arrangement that was made. I think under those circumstances my hon. friend from Selkirk will have to consider that he is in a minority on this question.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk): The hon. member for Edmonton, the ex-Minister of the Interior in the late Government (Mr. Oliver), the man responsible for this transaction, speaking before the House rose at one o'clock, made some statements in my absence which I deem it wise to refer to. But before doing so I wish to refer to one or two things that he said just before he resumed his seat. Speaking of the advantage that has accrued to the St. Peter's Indians from the surrender, the hon. gentleman would seek to leave the impression on the people that the surrender was a good thing for the Indians. Let us examine for a moment that feature of the matter. St. Peter's Indian Reserve was adjacent to the town of Selkirk; in fact, it formed a part of that town. It comprised 48,000 acres within 26 miles of Winnipeg. That land is worth to-day $2,500,000 if it is worth a dollar. On the evidence of some men that the hon. gentleman has quoted as being present at that meeting, and asking that these titles should be validated, this land was worth at the time of the surrender on an average of $25 an acre for the 48,000 acres. The hon. gentleman seeks to leave the impression that it was a good bargain for the Indians that this change had taken place. The Government and those who desired the surrender of this 48,000 acres of the most valuable land in Manitoba, selected a site 90 miles farther north, along the west shore of lake Winnipeg, and gave the Indians 70,000 acres of land there in lieu of the 48,000 acres they had taken from them. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that this land compared in value with the 48,000 acres taken from the Indians? Every man who knows anything about wild land in that part of Manitoba knows that from $3 to $4 an acre would be a good value to place upon this 70,000 acres of land. He acquired land from the Indians that was worth at the time it was taken $25 to $50 an acre. He took an estate from the St. Peter's Indians which is worth at least to-day $2,500,000. I ask if that is considered fair treatment of the Indians of this country.

The hon. gentleman says that I have taken a great interest in the Indians. I have. And why? It is not because I have any personal interest in them, not because there was any political kudos to be gained from it; the Indian has no vote, he has no influence, he has no money. I was in the town when this outrageous transaction took place and I would have been less than a man, I would have been unworthy of the position which I occupy in this House if I had not attempted to rectify that shameful transaction and expose it to this country. I thought that when I appealed to the Minister of the Interior of that time, the present hon. member for Edmonton, and, when he became seized of the facts, that I had laid before this House, he would take action and do something to rectify the great wrong which had been perpetrated on the St. Peter's Indians. But the hon. gentleman satis-

fied himself with taking up three hours of the time of the House in an attempt to dispute the charges which I had made and when he sat down he left every charge unanswered and the charge made by me against the Indian Department just as strong as it was before he rose to his feet. During every session from 1907 to 1911, I appealed to the hon. gentleman across the floor of this House to do something to relieve the situation and to see that a modicum of justice was done to the poor unfortunate Indians, but I appealed in vain. The hon. gentleman made no attempt to settle the question. The late Government should have settled that question immediately, but when their attention was called to the matter in this House the present hon. member for Edmonton, the man who is responsible for this transaction, sat tight in his place and allowed the matter to drift year after year without making any attempt to settle it although he was appealed to time and time again across the floor of this House and appealed to by residents of the town of Selkirk in just as strong articles as he has read from the Record to-day. Yet he made no attempt to settle the matter. He said: What we have done, we have done, the surrender was legal and it must stand. That is the position he took. The statements I made when I opposed the transaction I made after the most thorough investigation, I made with a full knowledge of my responsibility as a member of this House, and six or seven years having elapsed since that time, I have not one word to retract of what I said on that occasion.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Would the hon. gentleman briefly state what were the charges that he made?

Mr. BRADBURY: I will state some of them briefly. It would take too long to recite all of them.

Mr. MARTIN: I do not want the hon. gentleman to take too long.

Mr. BRADBURY: The charges were that the Indians had been fraudulently deprived of their very valuable estate, that the meeting called for the surrender had been manipulated by the Indian agent and by the officers of the Indian Department, that the meeting where this surrender was declared to be carried was advertised for but one day, that twenty-four hours' notice was all the time that was given to the band of Indians to gather and decide as to the surrender.

Mr. BLAIN: What year was that?

Mr. BRADBURY: That was in 1907. This reserve is about ten miles square. Many of the young Indians, at that season of the year, were at lake Winnipeg fishing. There must have been thirty or forty of the young members of the band who never heard of this meeting. I have under my hand now the testimony of men living within a mile of the place where this surrender was voted on, and these men swear that they never knew that the meeting was being held. Another charge was that the Indian Act had been violated, that clause 49 of the Act provided that a majority of the male members of the band of 21 years of age at the meeting must vote in favour of the surrender or the surrender would not be valid. That is a point in regard to which my hon. friend from Edmonton and I differ. I remember that when we were discussing this point, he was arguing in favour of the clause, and I asked him if a meeting was called where there were two hundred and some odd qualified voters, and if only twenty voters attended that meeting, could those twenty Indians legally alienate the interest of all the rest of the Indians? My answer to that question is that they could do it legally but perhaps not morally. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that in the opinion of two of the most reputable judges we have in Manitoba the position that the hon. gentleman had taken is utterly unjustifiable. A report was made by a Royal Commission appointed by the Manitoba Government and composed of three county court judges—Judges Prudhomme, Myers and Locke. Every hon. gentleman who comes from the West knows the reputation of these men. After a thorough examination of the whole case, two reports were brought in, a majority report and a minority report, but Judge Locke, speaking for himself and Judge Prudhomme, says:

> The surrender was not only voidable but void, and could not be ratified and should not be ratified.

That is the decision of those men at that time. Still the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who was responsible for the transaction, for three long years while he was minister of the department that perpetrated this transaction, made no attempt to rectify it. The consequence is that it has been handed down as a heritage to the present Government. I have not argued out of the House and I am not going to argue in the House that the matter has been expe-

dited as it should have been. I claim, and I have always claimed, that the matter should have been settled long ago. The fact that it has not been settled lies largely at the doors of the men who secured the land. They have been attempting to negotiate along a line of settlement by which the Indians would receive some further consideration, presuming that that would justify the Government in allowing the titles to be validated, but up to the present time nothing has been done. The hon. member for Edmonton read from a resolution a statement that the Indians of the St. Peter's reserve were satisfied. That resolution stated an absolute and unqualified falsehood, as the man who penned that statement knew when he put it into that resolution. The St. Peter's Indians, who have been loyal to the Crown, who have fought for this country more than once, feel that they have been defrauded by the Government of Canada. They have cried out for British fair-play ever since this surrender was taken, and they occupy the very same position to-day that they occupied six years ago. The hon. gentleman would like the impression to go abroad that the Indians are satisfied with their new reserve. Since the surrender was taken, and since the new reserve was created, in spite of all the inducements that could be offered by the Indian Department, less than half of the St. Peter's band of Indians have moved to the new reserve. They are at present in destitute circumstances. They are a charge upon the public of Canada to-day because of the rascally conduct of the late Administration in allowing them to be robbed of their inheritance. More than the Indian is involved in this transaction, because if the Indian is destitute, as he is to-day, the taxpayers of Canada have to take care of him. When this valuable estate was taken from the Indians and given to a few particular friends of the late Government, those people were robbing not only the Indians but the people of Canada. The consequence is to-day that the people of Canada have to dig down into their pockets to provide food and shelter for the remnant of the St. Peter's band that is left on the old reserve. At this late date in the session, I do not want to take up too much time, but the charge has been made by my hon. friend, although, frankly speaking, I would have thought that the hon. gentleman who was guilty, who was the man responsible for the transaction, would hardly have had the temerity to rise in his place and read those newspaper articles which he read to-day and make such statements in regard to the St. Peter's Reserve. People in glass houses should not throw stones. He knows as well as any one does that he and his department were guilty in allowing this surrender to be taken as it was. If the surrender had been taken fairly and honestly; if the Indian had been given notice for a week or ten days that surrender was to be taken; if he had been invited to meet the representatives of the department to discuss the arrangement openly and frankly, and if he had then agreed to the surrender, you would never have heard any complaint from any one in the town of Selkirk or anywhere else. I will tell you how the vote was taken. After two days' discussion in a little bit of a room, 18 x 24, where not one-half of the Indians could get in to hear what was taking place, the vote was taken. Indian after Indian swore before the commission that they had never heard the terms of the surrender read or explained to them; and that they did not know what they were voting for. This is how the vote was taken: The men were ordered out of the room into the open. There stood on one side the chief and the councillors who were in favour of this surrender, the men who, it turned out afterwards, had been bribed and purchased by those interested in securing the lands, because some of them got ten or twelve times as much land as the ordinary Indian got. Therefore, I am justified in saying that those men were bribed to secure the consent of the rest of the band. The evidence goes to show that no attempt was made to check the vote. The Indians were passing from one side to the other. A minister of the gospel, Rev. John Semmens, following out his instructions, no doubt, from Mr. Pedley, who was on the ground, when the vote was to be taken got on a box and said to those people: "All you who want $90, come to this side." I have under my hand the evidence of the chief who was in favour of this surrender. He swore that the statement made by Mr. Semmens caused the surrender to carry. Is anything further required to justify my statement as to fraud? Before the Indians left the room to go out to vote, Mr. Pedley, in discussing the matter with the Indians, said to them: "I have $5,000 here in this little black satchel; if the surrender carries, the money will be divided amongst you, and if it does not carry, I will take the money home and you will not

get a cent." The Indians thought they were going to get $5,000 for their vote. The Indian agent, Mr. J. O. Lewis, a man who was as guilty as the minister himself in this transaction—and that is saying a good deal—was the one who counted the votes in favour of a surrender. There was no one to check him at all. No one knows whether there was five of a majority in favour of a surrender or ten of a majority against a surrender, but it is claimed that there was nine of a majority in favour of a surrender. There was not nine of a majority of the legal voters of the band, because less than a majority was secured of the young men and old men who were qualified to vote. In other words, the Indian Act was violated as far as securing the votes of the whole band was concerned. The Act says distinctly that the majority of the male members of the band, twenty-one years of age, must be secured. Now, such a majority was not secured; consequently that surrender is illegal.

Mr. MORPHY: Who is Mr. Pedley?

Mr. BRADBURY: He was the Deputy Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs.

Mr. MORPHY: Is he in office now?

Mr. BRADBURY: No, he has been removed, or he resigned, I understand. I am not going to say that Mr. Pedley was to blame, for that would be taking an unfair advantage of an official of the department. The minister of that time must take the blame and so must the Government of which he was a member. I do not think, for a moment, that the deputy minister went out and negotiated and secured that surrender without the full consent of his minister. Consequently, what was done in securing the surrender, was done, I take it, with the full knowledge of that minister. But I must say that as hon. members who recollect the defence that that gentleman put up for that transaction will know, he displayed such utter ignorance of what had taken place that I should hesitate to believe, even now, that he really did know what was done in this matter, though, as head of the department, he is responsible.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) made the statement that if this surrender was illegal, every other surrender taken up to the present moment, was equally illegal. He is not well informed. The present Government composed of men who, when in Opposition condemned what the late Government did in this connection, took precautions to settle this matter, and not one surrender has been taken since this Government came into power in which the Indian Act has not been lived up to scrupulously. That there may be no misunderstanding let me quote clause 5 which takes the place of clause 49 of the Indian Act:

> A surrender must be assented to by a majority of the Indians whose names appear on the voters' list, who must be present at the meeting or council summoned for the purpose as hereinafter provided.

This makes plain what interpretation should have been placed on section 49. When the hon. gentleman made the statement that if the St. Peter's Indian surrender was illegal every other surrender in Canada was illegal, he is quite in error. Other surrenders taken before this matter was exposed in the House may have been as illegal as this, but I do not believe that there is anything in the records of Canada to show such a brazen attempt made to defraud the Indians as in the case of the St. Peter's Indian Reserve.

As to the matter published in the Selkirk Record and the Winnipeg Free Press, let me say this to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver): He is proprietor of a newspaper and knows a good deal about editing a newspaper, and a good deal about what reliance can be placed, sometimes, on the actions of a newspaper. There has been, during the last six weeks, a campaign to stampede the present Government into a settlement of this question, not only against the interest of the Indians, but against the interest of the people of Canada and against the interest of the town of Selkirk. For I say now from my place in Parliament, and with all due deference to my friends, some of whom are connected with these resolutions, and with all due deference to the Record, that, so far as the town of Selkirk is concerned, to my mind the greatest crime that could be committed against the town would be to validate the titles of the St. Peter's Indian Reserve and hand this property over to a bunch of grafters, men who will hold the land at exorbitant prices for years to come and prevent the very result that the people want, viz., the settling up of that district. The late Government professed that they were working in the interests of the people, that they held the land in trust for the people and believed in the policy of "the land for the settlers and not for the speculators." Had they lived up to this policy they could have purchased from the Indians at a reasonable figure, and that

4 p.m.

would have satisfied the Indians, forty-eight thousand acres of the best land in Manitoba. Then we should have had every acre of it settled by bona fide settlers to-day, but instead of that the Government of that day chose to play into the hands of a few speculators and only certain men could purchase these lands. A Conservative in the town of Selkirk at that time was told by the Indian agent that he need not attempt to buy the lands, that the department could give him no protection, and that he would be buying at his own risk. But Mr. Heap, a leading Liberal, Mr. Funk, a brother of Senator Funk of the United States, a very wealthy man, Mr. Frank of Winnipeg, another strong Liberal, and Mr Tracy of Selkirk, another strong Liberal—these were the men who bought from the Indians the lands all the way from one dollar to five dollars and six dollars an acre. God knows how the Indian was paid, for the Indian himself does not know. When he went in to make a payment, he got, perhaps, a ten-dollar bill, and was asked to sign a receipt for it, and that receipt was a deed for the man's property, and nobody knows what he got afterwards. There is a letter on file from the Indian agent himself, who was in this transaction, who told his minister that after the first payment was made it depended entirely upon the honour of the purchaser what the Indian got. That is a sample of what was done and of what the hon. member for Edmonton would urge the Government to legalize. Why, if the Government of Canada were to legalize an action of this kind which has been exposed and proven, all I say is that there is very little justice for the poor unfortunate Indian.

I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House in dealing with this attempt made by my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) to revive this case in the House. His advice to the Government is, practically, to validate these titles. Let us see how that would work out. Does he not know—I am sure he does—that the Registrar General of Manitoba has refused to issue a Torrens title on these patents issued by the Government and that before a Torrens title can issue some action must be taken by Parliament? Now, if that is true is that not evidence that the transaction was illegal in the first place, and if it was illegal why should it be legalized. I want to say, in passing, that I regret as much, and more, than the hon. gentleman from Edmonton, that this case was not settled years ago. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) ought to have settled this question before he went out of office, but he let the matter rest for three years without taking action. It may be said that that does not justify the delay on the part of the present Government. I am not going to argue that it does. This matter ought to have been settled, and those who had been in authority will bear me out when I say that no one has been more persistent than I have been in attempting to secure a settlement of this case year after year. I did not suggest the settlement that the hon. member for Edmonton wishes; I urged that the matter be taken to court and, if the surrender be proved legal, that the registrar general of Manitoba should recognize the patents and settle the matter for all time to come. The case is now, I understand, ready for trial in the Exchequer Court. It is worthy of remark that the very men who have been clamouring for a settlement of this case for the last four years have been making every effort possible to block the proceedings which have been taken to make it possible to secure an early settlement. What have these men to fear? If their conduct has been free from blame, why should they hesitate to allow this matter to go before the Exchequer Court for the opinion of the judge as to its legality? It is like the Irishman who went to an eminent lawyer when he was in trouble, and asked for his assistance. The eminent lawyer assured him that he would secure justice for him. "Well," said Pat, "it is not justice I want; I want to get out of this difficulty." And I think that some of the men who have obtained these lands do not want justice; they want to get the titles to the lands. This question ought to be settled, and the men who have secured these lands—some of which, I have no hesitation in saying, were literally stolen from the Indians—should not be allowed to retain them without recompensating the Indians in some way. Six of these men secured 35,000 acres of lands at less than $5 an acre: land which is the most valuable in the province of Manitoba, and which without any doubt, is worth to-day from $50 to $60 an acre. It is not too much to ask these men, even at this late date, to do justice to the Indians? My hon. friend stated that about half of this land was sold by public auction. That, of course, is in line with many other statements made by the hon. gentleman; it is not quite in accordance with the facts. Only about 15,000 acres out of 48,000 were sold by public auction. And how were they sold? The auction sale was manipulated just as skillfully as the

land itself was manipulated. The Department of Indian Affairs advertised the sale in six different issues of the Toronto Globe and the Winnipeg Free Press. The sales took place, I think, on December 16. There was a foot of snow on the ground; the advertisement had been withdrawn eighteen days before the sale took place, so that the public did not know anything about the sale when it did take place. The men who attended the sale were largely the same men who negotiated with the Indians for their little holdings; these are the men who got the land. No attempt was made by the Indian Department to secure a fair price for these lands.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: How many people were at the sale?

Mr. BRADBURY: I did not attend the sale, but I am told that in the morning there were present from five to ten men who represented these big holdings and fifteen or twenty Ruthenians who were anxious to obtain cheap land. These Ruthenians, by their bidding, made the other men bid up, and I understand that some of the land which was sold in the morning realized a price as high as $7 or $8 an acre. At lunch time an arrangement was made whereby a man was paid to take these foreigners into a barroom and keep them there until after the sale was finished. This is history; it is common knowledge in the town of Selkirk.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: What did the department have to do with that?

Mr. BRADBURY: Nothing at all; but the department should not have allowed the sale to take place under the conditions that it did. Imagine the trustee of an estate selling a valuable piece of land in the middle of winter.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman referred a few minutes ago to a report of the commission of judges appointed by the local government of the province of Manitoba. As I understand the matter, the two judges based their decision not upon the existence of fraud in connection with the sale of these lands, but upon the question of the interpretation of section 49 of the Indian Act.

Mr. BRADBURY: To some extent that is so, but not altogether. When the case was referred to these judges, the public understood that they were going to investigate not only the question of legality, but the question of alleged fraud as well. Judge Locke and Judge Prudhomme, in making their report, said this:

> One phase at a time. However, we thought it would be desirable to report on the validity of the surrender first and leave it to the Government to decide as to whether or not it is necessary for the commissioners in view of this finding proceed with the other branch of the duties entrusted to them.
>
> All of which is respectfully submitted.

They gave the Indians distinctly to understand that further investigation would be made into the fraudulent transactions between the purchasers and the Indians. This has never taken place. That is where I think the present Government have been entirely too lenient; they should have pushed the matter home more fully than they did.

I realize just as the men in Selkirk and all over the country realize, that this case ought to be settled and I am just as anxious as any man could be that it should be settled. I believe that the proper way is to settle this thing in court. There can be no question that if the surrender is legal the men who have got the land should be willing to allow the matter to go to the Exchequer court where it could be settled in a week. I made an offer five years ago to these men. I had authority to do it from the Registrar General of Manitoba. I was trying to get a settlement then and urged upon him to point out some way of settling it. He said: Get these men to take an action in court to force me to issue a Torrens title to any one of these properties; and if they make good, if they can get a judgment in their favour, I shall issue the title. That was a fair proposition, and if the men who had the land were satisfied that they were right and had nothing to hide or fear, would it not have been easy for them to take the case to court and ask the decision of the Manitoba court, where they had all their friends, Chief Justice Howell, who was a party to securing the surrender, being Chief Justice of Manitoba at the time. They did not dare take it to the courts because they knew that they had not a leg to stand on; and they have been working ever since trying to secure from the Government some legislation that will validate those titles.

During my last election, in 1911, these men spent thousands of dollars trying to defeat me in my county on account of what I had done in this transaction. No man in this House or out of it has ever insinuated or dared to insinuate that I had any personal interest in this matter. My action was dictated entirely in the interest of justice to the Indian who could not defend himself and the best interests

of my own town of Selkirk to make it impossible for 48,000 acres adjacent to the town, some of it within the limits of the town, to be tied up in the hands of speculators. I hold yet that I was justified in everything I did in trying to prevent these speculators from getting control of these lands.

The case is now in the hands, as I understand, of the Exchequer Court, and I hope it will come to trial very soon and that it will not stop there. I hope action will be taken to punish the men who have fraudulently dispossessed the Indians of their lands. There are men who have secured these lands as I have said before, who have literally stolen them from the Indians. These men ought to be prosecuted and punished, and it is up to the Indian Department to see that this is done.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: On several occasions when this matter has been discussed in the House I have taken some part in the discussion, and that is my reason for rising to-day. I have no concern about the quarrel the hon. member for Selkirk has with some of his constituents in regard to this question, the only interest I have in the matter is the question of whether or not the administration of the Indian Department under the late Government was properly carried out in connection with the surrender of the St. Peter's Indian Reserve. There is no question that for several years prior to the surrender in 1907 the people of Selkirk and the surrounding country were continually asking that this surrender be obtained.

Mr. BRADBURY: That statement was made, I think, by the then Minister of the Interor, now the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). There is not a line of evidence to justify that statement. The people of Selkirk never asked that the surrender should be made, nobody ever asked for it except the late member for Selkirk, Mr. Jackson. That was brought out in evidence.

Mr. MARTIN: My hon. friend may be better informed in that regard than I am, but I always understood that in and around Selkirk, as in the case of the surrender of other reserves in Canada, there was a movement on the part of settlers for the surrender of the reserve. I understood when the matter was discussed previously in the House, four or five years ago, that that was the case, and it was on that basis that I made my statements. The surrender was arranged for in 1907 and, in so far as I have been informed, no objection was taken by any residents of that district to the surrender being made provided it was made properly. I think my hon. friend himself was in favour of the surrender.

Mr. BRADBURY: So far as the town of Selkirk is concerned and myself personally, I agree with what was said by the hon. member for Edmonton, and I think it a good thing that the Indians have been moved; it is a good thing for themselves. But that does not justify robbing them.

Mr. MARTIN: The charges that were made repeatedly by the hon. member for Selkirk and other members on that side of the House some years ago, and the charges repeated by him to-day, are that, first, there was fraud in connection with the surrender of the reserve, either on the part of the department or on the part of men who subsequently bought these lands from the Indians, or on the part of both. A general charge was made that the Indians were fraudulently deprived of a very valuable asset. That is the main charge I have ever heard made, but I have never seen an iota of evidence to support it. It is easy to talk about fraud, but when you come down to the basis of things and get to facts it is difficult to prove the existence of what is really meant by fraud, and I would point out that apart from departmental fraud altogether if my hon. friend refers to fraud on the part of individuals in the province of Manitoba in getting lands from the Indians or from the department in connection with this reserve, they have their remedy. Why does not the Attorney General of Manitoba prosecute these men? Then we will have the question disposed of once and for all. That would not, it is true, dispose of a charge of fraud on the part of the department. As to the charge of fraud on the part of the department or on the part of Mr. Pedley, it all comes down to this, that Mr. Pedley had $5,000 in a little black valise, and said to the Indians: If this surrender goes through to-day I can make a part payment on the purchase price. That is all he meant, he did not pretend to buy the Indians. What benefit would he or any other officer get by bribing the Indians to hand over their land, to give the surrender? That is the whole question.

Mr. BRADBURY: I know the hon. gentleman wants to be fair. The facts are

these. The hon. member knows the Indian pretty well, probably as well as I do.

Mr. MARTIN: I do not admit that.

Mr. BRADBURY: And he knows the effect of making a statement such as Mr. Pedley did make to the effect: I have $5,000 here, and if this surrender goes through this will be divided among you, and if it does not go through, you will not get anything. I do not for a minute dispute that the money was supposed to come out of the sale of the Indian lands. I believe that myself, but the poor Indian did not understand it that way. He understood he was getting part of that $5,000.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Everybody who pays any attention to Indian Estimates knows that there is a vote every year for the purpose of obtaining the surrender of Indian reserves. Only the other night there was one for $25,000. I understand that it has always been customary to pay the Indians a small sum of money when the surrender is arranged for. I do not know what words Mr. Pedley used. My hon. friend knows, and I have no doubt he repeated the words correctly this afternoon. But considering the position Mr. Pedley occupied in the Indian Department, and that neither he nor any other Government official profited by this surrender, how could any reasonable man put the interpretation on these words that the hon. member for Selkirk has; namely, that Pedley wanted to bribe these Indians and led them to believe they would get this money, in addition to whatever price they got for their land. I know a little about Indians; I have seen some of them, although I am not so familiar with them as my hon. friend from Selkirk, who is particularly familiar with the St. Peter's Reserve. But the Indian as a rule is a pretty shrewd man, and I have no doubt the Indians knew perfectly well that that $5,000 was a payment on account of the purchase price for the lands being surrendered, and that it was not in addition at all. The hon. member for Selkirk knows that perfectly well. That is the sum and substance of the charge of fraud, in so far as the department is concerned. With the exception of this $5,000, I have never heard of any other charge being brought against the department. I venture to say that not a court in the land would hold the officials of the department guilty of fraud on the evidence that has been produced by the hon. member for Selkirk from time to time. What is the other charge he makes? He says the meeting was only advertised for a very short time.

Mr. BRADBURY: Twenty-four hours.

Mr. MARTIN: I cannot lay my finger upon it, but I understand the provision is that the meeting shall be called in accordance with the regulations of the band. What were the regulations of this band? I do not know, my hon. friend has not told us. In looking over this report I find that the judges expressed the opinion that sufficient notice of the meeting was not given, but they distinctly say that, so far as the evidence was concerned, they could not say that it was not called in accordance with the regulations of the band. Further, to substantiate the belief that the Indians were notified, there is the fact that, at the meeting, out of 223 men who were entitled to vote 205 were present.

Mr. BRADBURY: The hon. gentleman has not got the vote right. There were 289 qualified votes in St. Peter's band at the time, and 205 were present.

Mr. MARTIN: Two hundred and twenty-three are the figures I have but I may be mistaken. At any rate 205 out of 289 is a fairly good representation. In so far as any proceedings in court are concerned, I venture the opinion that the whole matters simmers down, not to a question of fraud at all, but to the question of the interpretation of section 49 of the Indian Act; and in the report that was presented to the Manitoba Government by the commission of judges appointed by that province, one of the three judges puts an altogether different interpretation on that clause from the other two. Two of the judges say that a majority of the whole band must vote at the meeting. The other one says that the proper interpretation is that the vote must be supported by a majority of those present at the meeting. Let me read the clause to the House:

> Except as in this Parliament otherwise provided, no release or surrender of a reserve, or a portion of reserve, held for the use of the Indians of any band, or of any individual Indian, shall be valid or binding, unless the release or surrender shall be assented to by a majority of the male members of the band of the full age of twenty-one years, at a meeting or council thereof summoned for that purpose.

As I said, one of the judges appointed by the province of Manitoba saw fit to interpret the section to this effect: that a majority of those present was all that was required. The other two say that that is not correct. So there we have at least a

difference of opinion among judges who are eminently qualified to express an opinion upon the interpretation of that clause. When you consider that every surrender of a reserve has, up to the time of the surrender of the St. Peter's Reserve, always been carried out on that basis, I think we are justified in coming to the conclusion that a proper interpretation was placed upon that clause, especially in view of the fact that three judges of the land disagree on the matter.

Mr. BRADBURY: If that is right, would it not have been a very easy matter for the Indian Departmnt to submit the case to the courts for decision? But they would not do that.

Mr. MARTIN: I am not here to criticise the old Administration, but I would say this to my hon. friend: he has spent, and to my mind wasted, a tremendous amount of the time of this House and of his own time during three or four years. If the interpretation placed upon that Act by the ex-Minister of the Interior was not correct, why did not my hon. friend's friends rectify it as soon as they came into power?

Mr. BRADBURY. They should have done so.

Mr. MARTIN: The matter appears to me to be this way. There are a great many innocent purchasers of this land. My hon. friend does not mean to say that all the men who purchased this land from the Indians were guilty of fraud. No; a large proportion of them are innocent purchasers. That being the case, it is very difficult for me to understand how the Provincial Government can step in to the Land Titles Office and say: You shall not issue patents to the hundreds of men who have purchased the land quite innocently. In order to make political capital out of this matter against the late Government, and in an endeavour to show that the late Governmeent did not deal fairly with the Indians and the natural resources of this country, my hon. friend resorted to the Roblin Government for the purpose of creating a political furore about this particular surrender. And now the chickens are coming home to roost.

Mr. BRADBURY: As I understood it from the Registrar General, the Manitoba Government had absolutely nothing to do with it. It was the Registrar General himself on his own responsibility, because he is responsible to the Government for every title he issues, and my hon. friend as a lawyer knows that.

Mr. MARTIN: I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. BARDBURY: It is absolutely right.

Mr. MARTIN: The Government of Manitoba is responsible.

Mr. BRADBURY: The Government of Manitoba is responsible to the people, and the Registrar General to the Government. The consequence was that when the Rigistrar General refused to issue those titles, the Government in its own defence appointed this commission to demonstrate whether the Registrar General was justified in what he was doing. That explains the situation if I understand it correctly, and I think I do. That is the only attempt the Manitoba Government made to get this matter settled, and if the commission had found out that the patents had been issued properly and the surrender taken legally, there would have been no question about it.

Mr. MARTIN: The Manitoba Government and the hon. member for Selkirk, for the purpose of making political capital out of this question and throwing discredit on the late Government, got the Registrar General to refuse to issue the patents.

Mr. BRADBURY: No man can dictate to Mr. McAra, the Registrar General of Manitoba.

Mr. MARTIN: The Government of the province of Manitoba appointed a commission of three judges for the purpose of seeing what kind of a surrender this was, and to investigate the charges of fraud. The judges all expressed the opinion that there was no fraud at all on the part of the Indian Department. You can read the report from one end to the other and you will not find a word as to fraud on the part of the Indian Department. So it is a question of the interpretation of section 49 of the Indian Act, and that is all there is to it, and that seems to me a very small question to have taken up so much of the time of the House in the last six or seven years. There was a time, when, listening to the remarks of my hon. friend at such extended length, I began to think that there might be something wrong. Having taken occasion to look into the matter I came to the conclusion then, as I believe to-day that section 49 is absolutely the only thing that is at issue in connection with this whole matter. I venture the opinion that

in the case that is before the Exchequer Court to-day, unless some fraud can be established against some one or more of these purchasers, every one of them will get his patent.

Now let us consider for a moment what took place in connection with the sale. My hon. friend says that this land is worth $2,500,000. He knows that when he says that he talks rubbish. It means $50 or $60 per acre for ordinary farm land. Does my hon. friend say that that land is as valuable as land on Portage Plains or in the Neepawa district?

Mr. BRADBURY: Yes, I mean to say that no land in Manitoba is as valuable as the St. Peter's Reserve land.

Mr. MARTIN: My hon. friend calls into question the genuineness of the auction sale and casts aspersions upon the conduct of those who had to do with it. It is a difficult matter to carry out an understanding between an auctioneer and 200 or 300 purchasers at an auction sale. My hon. friend says that a great many foreigners went to this sale expecting to be able to get some farm land. How did they expect to get cheap farm land at St. Peter's Indian Reserve when, according to the hon. gentleman, that land was worth $50 or $60 an acre? In any event, in so far as the Indians were concerned, they got 25,000 acres of land. I do not know how many acres were sold; I understand that 25,000 acres were sold, but my hon. friend says that there were only 15,000 acres sold. If there were only 15,000 acres sold then there are 10,000 acres left to the credit of the Indians. At all events they got the benefit of the sale of 15,000 acres of land and the proceeds of that sale go to their credit in the Indian Trust Fund. In addition to that the Indians got 20,000 acres in severalty. At the auction sale 15,000 acres of farm land were sold. There were over a hundred people at that sale, there was open bidding, 15,000 acres of land were purchased and the average price paid was only $5.76 per acre.

Mr. BRADBURY: I would like to correct my hon. friend when he makes the statement that there were over a hundred people at the sale because he is stating something that is absolutely contrary to the fact. There never were more than twenty people at the sale and more than half of them were foreigners.

Mr. MARTIN: The information I have is altogether contrary to that. I was not present, of course, and my hon. friend was not present, and he does not know anything more about it than I do.

Mr. BRADBURY: It took place in my town.

Mr. MARTIN: My information is that the sale was largely attended and my hon. friend's information is that there was a very small attendance. However, we will not delay over that question. As a matter of fact school lands sold in Manitoba in that very same year did not produce any more per acre.

Mr. OLIVER: And the school lands were offered on more favourable terms.

Mr. MARTIN: Yes, under a ten-year term. We know that in the West, where a large quantity of land is put on the market at once, it is not an uncommon thing for ordinary farm land to go fairly cheap at an auction sale. Sometimes cases occur where a piece of land close to a town is offered for sale, a lot of people living in the town want to buy it and the price runs up far beyond the value of farm land. But the fact is that at this auction sale 15,000 acres of land, notwithstanding the fact that every person who dealt in real estate in Winnipeg knew that the sale was going to be held, sold for $5.76 per acre. The people of the town of Selkirk knew that this sale was being held. My hon. friend knew it; why did he not go to the sale with some of his friends and see that the Indians got their just due? In addition to that, the portion of the 20,000 acres that the Indians got in severalty realized from $3 to $20 per acre: It does not appear to me that in connection with this sale the Indians were defrauded. In so far as the question of the Indians being defrauded by purchasers is concerned, if what my hon. friend says is true, it is the duty of the Attorney General's Department of the province of Manitoba to immediately prosecute those men who have defrauded these Indians out of their lands.

Mr. BRADBURY: Do you not think it is the duty of the Indian Department as the guardian of the Indians?

Mr. MARTIN: Well, then my hon. friend has influence with the Indian Department; he might exert it. He has taken three and a half years to get nothing done. The late Government did not do anything on his representations because they did not believe that there was anything whatever in the charges that the hon. gentleman made. When the judgment of the Exchequer Court

is given, if these cases ever come to trial, I venture to give my opinion that he will find that there is nothing in them. The Indian will be exactly where he was seven or eight years ago and the town of Selkirk, and the purchasers who have been held up for their patents, will be exactly in the same position as they were in seven or eight years ago. In one of the articles quoted by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) the statement was made that the town of Selkirk has lost seven or eight years of its development by reason of the agitation which has been carried on.

My hon. friend says that the Indians were further defrauded in that they were not given a chance to get their patents direct but that somebody else got them. My information is that there were 400 patents issued for each one of which the Indian Department obtained a receipt and that these receipts are in the Department of Indian Affairs to-day. The department refused to recognize the assignment of an Indian's rights to another and they insisted on forwarding the patent directly to the Indian and getting his receipt. For that purpose the patents were sent to the Indian agent at Selkirk, he got the receipts immediately and the receipts are on file here. What fraud is there in that? In connection with the surrender of the St. Peter's Indian Reserve, the only question that has ever come before the committee at any time is the question as to whether or not the word "majority" in section 49 of the Indian Act means a majority of the men present at the meeting or a majority of the men who are entitled to vote in the tribe.

Mr. KYTE: Has the minister had any recent correspondence with the authorities in Sydney relative to the proposal to remove the Indians from the reserve near that city?

Mr. ROCHE: I do not think there is any recent correspondence. The last I remember was received during the last session of Parliament.

Mr. KYTE: No action has been taken?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

British Columbia—to provide a further amount for the relief of destitute Indians, $10,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the present condition of the Indians of the Kitsilano reserve, where are they located and what reports has the minister as to their present financial condition?

[Mr. W. M. Martin.]

Mr. ROCHE: There is no change in the situation as compared with what it was when we were discussing this question a year ago. The Indians were removed from the reserve and they went to other reserves, I understand. I have not heard that there has been any bad effect from the payment to the Indians to secure the surrender any more than there was in the case of the Indians in the neighbourhood of Victoria on the Songhees reserve. The case at the present time is before the Royal Commission. They have not adjudicated yet upon the case and that is the reason why I have nothing further to report than I brought to the attention of the House last session.

Mr. OLIVER: The reason I ask in regard to the condition of these Indians is because of the difference in their situation from that of the Songhees Indians. The Songhees Indians were paid for one reserve and given another. The Kitsilano Indians were paid by the British Columbia Government, and they were not given another reserve. I was anxious to know exactly what had become of them, where they were located now and what their financial circumstances were. The minister will bear in mind that there is a very radical difference between the two conditions. The Songhees have a definite reserve to which they have clear title and which they are now in occupation of, whereas the Kitsilano Indians, so far as I know, have no reserve.

Mr. STEVENS: I think I can explain the matter if the minister will permit me. The hon. member is mistaken in the statement that the Kitsilano Indians have no reserve to go to. There are about half a dozen small reserves around Vancouver to which the Squamish band belongs, and I think that is the general name of the band. Only a very few of the Indians who claimed a right in the Kitsilano reserve, actually live on the reserve, and the rest are nomads so far as that reserve is concerned. Sometimes they go up the north shore of Burrard inlet to the Squamish mission, sometimes to the Kapilano reserve or the Seymour reserve, so that they are not homeless in any sense. They have the other sections of the district to which they go and where they are now living, and they are, as far as I know, living in very good circumstances. I do not know of any evil effects having come to the Indians from the transaction.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. member's explanation is hardly adequate. If all the small reserves belong to the one band, the whole of the band had a right to share in any distribution of money in regard to one part of it.

Mr. STEVENS: That would not follow.

Mr. OLIVER: It does follow then that those of the Kitsilano band who received the money on account of that reserve have no equal rights with the Indians occupying the other parcels of land said to be under the control of the Squamish band. My hon. friend cannot have it both ways. Either the band as a whole should have been paid for that reserve, or those of the band who were paid have not equal rights with the other members of the band in the other reserves, and as a matter of fact they are either trespassers on the other smaller reserves or they are there on suffrance by the members of those bands. It is quite likely that Indians who have received large payments such as they did are very welcome amongst their fellows, and very likely their circumstances are entirely satisfactory; but their condition is not parallel to that of the Indians of the Songhees Reserve. Has there been any assumption of occupation or ownership on the part of the Government of British Columbia in the Kitsilano Reserve?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the Department of the Interior assert and exercise supervision and control in the matter of necessary protection of property and so on upon that reserve at the present time.

Mr. ROCHE: The position of the Department of the Interior is exactly as it was prior to the surrender of that reserve to the Provincial Governm nt. We have not recognized that surrender in any way, shape, or form. Our position is exactly the same as though the surrender had not taken place.

Mr. OLIVER: That is hardly the answer I wished for, although I do not want to press the matter too strongly. After the Indians vacated the reserve, the public press stated that the buildings and property of the Indians were destroyed by the order of the British Columbia Government without the authority of the Department of Indian affairs for the Dominion. I would think that is a very undesirable condition; and while I do not wish to press too strongly, the question that I wish to ask is: Does the department of my hon. friend simply ignore that reserve and the conditions on it, as it did at the time the negotiations were being made for the transfer of the Indians and at the time of the destruction of the houses or does it give the officers of tthe department instructions to exercise supervision and control upon that property with a view of protecting it until such time as the commission reports?

Mr. ROCHE: As I say, there has been no change. No instructions have been given other than those which the agent received and was exercising prior to the surrender. As the hon. gentleman has stated, what few houses there were have been burned. The Indians have left the reserve. There is practically no jurisdiction to exercise; that is, there are no Indians to supervise; there is no property to protect, and the duty of the agent there would not be of a very onerous character.

Mr. OLIVER: The question that I wanted to ask and that I think I may consider has been answered by the minister is whether the Indian Department of the Federal Government, or the Government of British Columbia exercises proprietary rights in the reserve. I would be bound to conclude that it is the Government of British Columbia which exercises those proprietary rights at the present time, and not the Department of Indian Affairs.

Department of the Interior—Scientific institutions—construction and installation of a large reflecting telescope for the Dominion Astronomical Observatory (Western branch)—Further amounted required, $4,939.80.

Mr. OLIVER: How much is this excursion of ours to the stars going to cost?

Mr. ROCHE: The land on which this telescope is to be erected is to cost rather more than was estimated. The British Columbia Government promised to pay $10,000 towards the purchase as well as build the roads which are estimated to cost over $20,000. The land cost $14,939, and it is this excess of cost that we are now asking for. The telescope itself cost in the neighbourhood of $90,000.

Mr. OLIVER: And how much will the building and installation cost?

Mr. ROCHE: We are not going on except by piecemeal. We are not now building any buildings except such as are absolutely necessary. We estimate that the cost of buildings and telescope will be in the neighbourhood of $100,000.

Dominion lands and parks—to pay the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company, successors to the Canadian Northwest Irrigation Company, compensation for deficiency in area, $43,439.34, and interest at 5 per cent per annum on over-payment of $36,707.43, from 12th June, 1909, to 31st August, 1914, $9,579.13, $53,018.47.

Mr. ROCHE: The Government had made an arrangement with the Canadian Northwest Irrigation Company for the sale of 500,000 acres of land on irrigation conditions at $3 per acre, with a rebate of $2 per acre on the works being completed. Their interests were transferred to the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company, but it was found that in the area set aside the requisite number of acres were not to be had, as they had not taken into consideration that there were school lands which can only be sold by public auction. Therefore, the company got only about 467,000 acres, and they applied to the late Government for permission to select elsewhere, but were refused. They had considerable negotiation both with the late Government and with the present Government for a refund, and this vote is for the refund.

Dominion land and parks—Canadian national parks—further amount required, $32,000.

Mr. ROCHE: This is to pay several items. There is a balance of the amount of extras on the bath-house at Banff. It was estimated at $100,000, but will cost $117,000. The contract was $110,000, and there are extras of $2,219, plus architect's fees, $5,610, or a total cost of $117,829, leaving a balance over the estimate of $17,829. Then we had to provide for expenses in connection with a very large forest fire at Yoho park. We had also to undertake works in connection with the Banff water supply. The Banff hotels have in the past paid on a fixed basis. The use of water has largely increased, and on the expiry of contracts, it has been deemed advisable to install meters in hotels, livery stables, etc., and to charge on the basis of the water used.

Immigration—relief other than seed grain for settlers in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, $1,275,000.

Mr. ROCHE: This is to cover the months that run into the fiscal year 1916. We have provided for relief for April, May and June.

Dominion lands and parks—to pay the balance of expenses connected with the moving of the residences of the people of the town of Frank, Alberta—revote, $13,839.32.

Mr. ROCHE: The Dominion Lands and Park.

[Mr Roche.]

Mr. OLIVER: Has the town been entirely removed?

Mr. ROCHE: Not yet.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it in contemplation to provide for entire removal?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, I understand so.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the removal progress at the option of the citizens or how?

Mr. ROCHE: Some of the citizens requested the Government to have it removed. The provincial authorities and the owners have been contributing towards the expenses. The total expense has been $69,200, of which the Provincial Government provides $20,000, the owners $19,200 and this Government $30,000.

Progress reported.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

PROPOSED GOVERNMENT OPERATION.

On motion of Hon. Frank Cochrane (Minister of Railways and Canals) Bill No. 119, to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

Progress reported.

CHARLES ISAAC ALEXANDER DIVORCE BILL.

Mr. GEORGE McCRANEY (Saskatoon) moved:

That the Bill from the Senate, for the relief of Charles Isaac Alexander, be referred back to the Committee on Private Bills for further consideration.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Would my hon. friend explain why this motion is thought to be necessary?

Mr. McCRANEY: This is a Divorce Bill which stands in my name. The evidence has been taken, it has passed the Senate, and it came before this House this morning and received the first and the second reading. It was referred to the Committee on Private Bills. The Committee on Private Bills considered it this morning, and I understand it was thrown out by a vote of 7 against the Bill to 6 in its favour. On behalf of the petitioner in whose interest the Bill is before the House, I would like the Bill to have some further consideration from the committee, which was small and which might on another occasion come to another conclusion.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The sum of it seems to be that the committee did meet and met properly and did consider the Bill and gave it proper consideration and passed upon it. This action, if it were carried out, would make these committees continuous according to the wishes of members on either side of the House. What I mean is that it seems rather a strong proceeding, just after the committee has met and come to a conclusion and reported, that the matter should be referred back to it. Perhaps my hon. friend would let it lie until Saturday and bring it up then.

Mr. McCRANEY: I am in the hands of the House, because what I ask for must be done with the consent of the House. I did not wish to be here on Saturday.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If some hon. gentleman would take it up for my hon. friend on Saturday, I think it would be better to leave it over until then.

Motion stands.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), Bill No. 110, to amend the Dominion Elections Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1, section 61—Dominion Elections Act amended:

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps the minister would explain the purpose of the Bill and what the changes are?

Mr. DOHERTY: This is the Bill reported by the committee that was appointed to inquire into the Dominion Elections Act and the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, and to suggest amendments to them. The Bill is the result of the considerations of the committee, and has been unanimously submitted to the House. I do not wish it to be understood that the committee was absolutely wedded to the provisions of this Bill, although those provisions commended themselves to their judgment. We placed the Bill before the House, of course expecting that it will be considered, and we are quite open to receive any suggestions. The first section of the proposed Bill repeals or amends section 61 of the Dominion Elections Act, which is a section which provides the oath to be administered in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, there being special provisions for the method of carrying on an election in these provinces. The substantial effect of this clause is that the provisions of section 62, in so far as the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta are concerned, are repealed, and it is the repeal of those sections that leads to the other provisions that are contained in this particular section. Under the section repealed there is a provision whereby a voter presenting himself at the poll, even although his name be not upon the lists that have been prepared by enumerators under the special provisions for those provinces, may be sworn by the deputy returning officer as to his qualifications, and may, upon his swearing to his qualifications, be permitted to vote. The present provision would repeal that, and the consequence of repealing that necessitates an alteration in the oath to be administered to the voter in those provinces, making applicable the oath administered in other provinces where there is no such provision.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It does not repeal this, it only amends it by providing what oath may be administered.

Mr. DOHERTY, So far as the oath is concerned, it is amended by providing that the oath that may be put to these persons by reason of the fact that there was a provision that a man might be allowed to vote on his merely taking an oath of his qualifications, not being on a list at all, being repealed, then, instead of prescribing the oath "x", which is the oath of qualification, the prescription is that he shall take the usual oath as taken in the other provinces; but the provision of the Act under which he may be allowed to vote, although on no list, merely by taking an oath that he is a qualified person, is repealed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What section repeals that?

Mr. DOHERTY: Section 62 is amended by striking out "provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta." Section 62, as it reads now, provides that in the Yukon territory and in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, a man will be allowed to present himself and to vote upon taking the oath of qualification. We repeal it as regards the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta by striking out of that section the words "the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan," leaving the provision standing, but only as applicable to the Yukon territories.

Mr. TURRIFF: In repealing those clauses as they apply to Saskatchewan and Alberta, is it the intention of the Govern-

ment to adopt the provincial list in connection with Dominion elections?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no provision in the Bill altering the other provisions of the Act as they now stand.

Mr. ROGERS: Is the report of the committee making the recommendations upon which the Bill is founded a unanimous report?

Mr. DOHERTY: As I explained before my colleague came in, while the committee was unanimous in submitting the Bill, we did not wish it to be understood that we were absolutely wedded to these provisions. We present them to the House with perfectly open minds as to any suggestions that may come as to their desirability. While I think the provisions commended themselves to the judgment of the committee, upon such examination as we were able to make and with such information as we had, we shall of course be glad to profit by the possibly greater knowledge of hon. gentlemen from the provinces concerned, who are certainly in a better position to judge of the conditions there than at least I should be.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I was one of the members of the special committee which had under consideration the Controverted Elections Act and the Dominion Elections Act. In considering the Controverted Elections Act it became necessary, of course, to give some consideration to the Dominion Elections Act, and, as the minister has stated, the first three or four clauses were unanimously concurred in for presentation to the House. As the first two clauses of the Bill have occassioned some little comment from hon. members from the Western provinces since being brought down to the House, I might say that these amendments came up accidently and incidentally, and we gave very little consideration to the matter indeed. During our consideration of the several clauses of the Dominion Elections Act, one member of the committee pointed out that in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and the Yukon, additions might be made to the electoral franchise list up to and including the very day of polling. Although I believe that is a provision of the Act, it was a revelation to me. It struck me as being an absurd provision in these days, and particularly as regards the old provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and I still say that it is a misfortune that such a provision should be in the Act. Further, I have since recognized that we failed to give consideration to other sections of the Bill relative to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and the Yukon territory. That is Part II of the Bill. Under the system of electoral registration prevailing in those two provinces and the Yukon, provision is made for the registration of electors, but they have to register within a period of eight days. There is a further provision that on election day any person claiming to be an elector may enroll and poll his vote upon taking the oath. When we were considering this Bill in the committee I myself was under the impression that these provisions were supplemental to the provincial electoral lists, or that there was a more comprehensive method of enrolling electors, and I was not sympathetic towards the continuance in the statute of a provision enabling electors to enroll on election day. I would consider that an unfortunate provision in the law of any country, unless there were very good reasons for it. Since my attention has been called to it, it is quite apparent to me that these amendments would be unfair in the circumstances, unless the provincial lists were adopted, or a more comprehensive system of enrolment of electors was contained in the statute. I think that the members of the committee failed to take that into consideration. I should very gladly vote for an amendment to the Dominion Elections Act, if that could be done easily, making the provincial lists applicable for Dominion purposes, or adding further provisions providing for a longer time during which to enroll. But I recognize that in order to make both these amendments or either of them would take a great deal of time, and delay the Bill unduly. I would therefore suggest to the minister the withdrawal of sections 1, 2 and 3 of Bill 110. It is quite true that the committee were unanimous in recommending these sections to the House, and no one more than another was responsible for that. As soon as it was suggested I readily concurred, together with my colleague from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), who was on the same committee. I do trust, however, that in the circumstances it will be agreeable to the minister to withdraw these provisions from the Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: As I understood it in the committee, these sections were adopted principally by reason of the hearty approval of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), and I think likewise of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell).

Mr. CARVELL: With a slight reservation.

Mr. DOHERTY: Possibly. Personally I confess I relied largely on their view of the matter. However, if it appears that those who come from the western provinces directly affected, and who are much more familiar with conditions there than I and the majority of the members of the committee pretend to be, look upon these provisions as undesirable, I would not for a moment insist on pressing the suggested amendment. I may point out that I do not think it would be proper to drop entirely the section, because part of its purpose was to amend an error that is evidently in the present statute, in so far as it refers to the oath that is to be taken by persons who are not on the list. Secton 63 of the present Act provides:

Every person whose name is on the voters' list, unless sworn as in the next preceding section provided, shall before being permitted to vote, if required by any candidate, agent or elector, take the oath No. 1 in form Z.

On turning up oath No. 1 in form Z it will appear at once that what it was intended to say was oath No. 2 in form Z, and I think the statute ought to be amended so as to meet that requirement. Oath No. 1 in form Z is the oath that would be required of a person who was not upon the list at all, whereas evidently the oath that is intended is oath No. 2 form Z—the oath against bribery—because it is applicable to a man whose name is on the list. We retain that in any event. We do not interfere with the law which permits a man to swear his qualifications there and then. We are retaining section 62 of the Act, but subsection 2 of the Bill provides that section 62 is to be amended by substituting the word "two" for the word "one" in the fourth line thereof. The rest of that subsection might very well be dropped.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Would the minister please read the oath of the voter whose name is not on the list?

Mr. DOHERTY: The oath to be taken by the voter whose name is not on the list is as follows:

You do swear that you are of the male sex and a British subject, that you are not an Indian, you are of the full age of twenty-one years, and that you have resided in the province of Saskatchewan or Alberta or the Yukon territory (as the case may be) for at least twelve months, and (in case of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta) in this electoral district for at least three months, immediately preceding the issue of the writ of election, and that you are now resident in this polling division, (the last ten words shall be omitted from the oath in the case of a person voting under section 59 or in Yukon territory.) So help me God.

That oath is intended to be taken by a person who, not being on the list, not having been enumerated, is allowed to vote because he swears that he has the necessary qualifications, whereas section 63 deals with the oath which is intended to be administered to the person whose name is on the voter's list. It is quite evident that it was intended by this section to require the person whose name is on the voter's list to take the oath that he was qualified to vote and that he had not received any money or reward for his vote. That oath, I think we ought to retain.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Speaking from memory, I think there is something in the general Act which provides that where a person has voted in the name of a voter, and the real voter comes along afterwards, the latter is entitled to vote. In that case the ballots are kept separate. May I ask the minister now how a case of that kind is dealt with in the West? Will the ballots of those persons who tendered their votes under these circumstances be placed in the box with the other ballots or will they be placed in a separate envelope?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think it is possible for that situation to arise. There is a provision under which track can be kept of two men each claiming to be the voter whose name is on the list. However, in this case the question does not arise of one man trying to represent that he is another man and therefore entitled to vote. The man whose name is not on the list simply takes the oath that he is entitled to vote.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Ten or twenty men might go to a polling place, take the oath and vote whether their names were on the list or not.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: There was at one time such an Act in the unorganized district of Ontario but time proved that it was rather a bad Act and it was elminated from the statutes.

Mr. CARVELL: I would imagine that if the proposed amendment to the Act as applied to Saskatchewan and Alberta were withdrawn section 63a in the new Bill would also have to be either withdrawn or amended. I think that was the question

that the minister was speaking to. There is evidently a mistake in the law as it reads. This was all threshed out in the committee but it will be made plain to any hon. gentleman who will follow the section as it is. In the Elections Act there is a particular part called part two which applies to Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon Territory. Sections 31 to 65 apply exclusively to these provinces and this territory. Section 61 provides for the oath which may be administered in these two provinces and reference to form Z is in two parts. Part 1 is the oath that a person must take who claims to have the right to vote because he is a resident. That is the man who was referred to by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) a few moments ago. A man comes up and says I am a resident of Alberta, I have been here for a year, or whatever time may be required, my name is not on the list and I demand the right to vote. Then he would take what is called oath No. 1 in form Z. Then, if some other person wants to challenge him on the ground that he has been guilty of bribery, he takes oath No. 2 in form Z. Oath No. 2 in form Z is practically the same as the general oath in form Y. If you abolished the right of a man to swear in his vote you would abolish the whole of form Z and bring him under the general law by which a man might be called upon to take the bribery oath as prescribed in form Y. If you go back to the original condition of affairs you must leave in form Z. But there is a mistake made in section 63 because it says:

> Every person whose name is on the voters' list, unless sworn as in the next preceding section provided, shall before being permitted to vote, if required by any candidate, agent or elector, take the oath number one in Form Z.

If a man's name is on the list he should not be required to take the oath No. 1 because No. 1 is the oath which the man takes if his name is not on the list. I do not think that is what it was intended to provide for. The man whose name is on the list has the right to vote provided he takes the proper oath which is Form Z 2. You would have to change the word "one" in the fourth line of section 63 to the word "two" and then it would provide that the voter should take oath No. 2 instead of No. 1.

Mr. McCRANEY: Suppose a name is improperly on the enumerator's list as far as qualification goes, may the man not be challenged and may he not be required to take oath No. 1 as well as oath No. 2?

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. CARVELL: That was not our idea.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) are in error in imagining that there is a mistake in the present Act because there is none. You must remember that the list made in Saskatchewan and Alberta has nothing in common with the list you have in other parts of Canada. This is simply a pen and ink list which is made after the proclamation has been issued and it must be posted up eight days before the election. Any man may go to the enumerator and ask to have his name put on. The enumerator as a rule does not swear that man or make any particular effort to satisfy himself that the man is entitled to vote and the name goes on the list whether the applicant is entitled to vote or not. Many a name is put on these individual lists. There is a special list for each polling division. In my own constituency last election there were 111 enumerators appointed. The idea of the oath is all right. Many names may be put on the list of persons who are not entitled or qualified to vote, men who may not be British subjects, may not have resided a year in the province and may not have resided three months in the electoral district. It is very necessary to keep that oath as it is. If you want to provide further that, in addition to taking that oath of qualification, each voter who is not on the list, should also be sworn as to bribery, there is no objection as to that. That could be done as it is; but if it cannot be done, there will be no objection to having a man whose name is not on the list take both the oaths. I can quite understand my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and other members of the committee who are not from either Saskatchewan or Alberta not realizing what they were doing when they proposed to put in these amendments, which would put the elections simply into the hands of a large number of enumerators who might be good enumerators or who might be bad ones. I do not like the present system of making the lists that we have in Alberta and Saskatchewan. The time has come when there should be a better system. Those provinces are old enough and settled up enough now to have the same system as is followed in the other provinces. It is very awkward for a candidate to come up on the day of an election and have no idea as to who is on the voters' list. If you are to do away with the right of a man to vote by coming up on election day and putting his

name on the list, then you must have a proper provision for the making of the list and the revision of the list. There is at present no provision for the revision of the list by the enumerator at each polling division.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Yes, there is.

Mr. TURRIFF: I beg your pardon. Any one can go to an enumerator and ask him to put on or to take off certain names, but he does not need to do so. Until you have a proper list, of which there would be a proper revision, you must leave in the statute that provision by which a bona fide voter, who is perfectly entitled to vote but whose name is left off the pen and ink list inadvertently or by design, may go up on election day take the oath that he is qualified and that he has not been bribed, and register his vote.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is there any provincial list?

Mr. TURRIFF: There is a provincial list in the province of Saskatchewan, but not in the province of Alberta.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. member for Assiniboia contends that under section 62 new names may be added to the voter's lists up to and including election day. Before a vote is registered, the oath must be put to the voter under section 63.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The proposed change in this Act was probably made by the committee in consequence of certain conditions that I pointed out to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and subsequently to the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). During all the elections that I have seen in western Canada—and they have all been conducted under the auspices of hon. gentlemen opposite—the conditions now imposed by the statute have tended to two things: first, to a limitation of the exercise of the franchise by those who should exercise it, and, secondly, to corruption of the worst type. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B., was very much impressed with the fact when I went over the Act and showed it to him, and for that matter so was the hon. junior member for Halifax. I then directed the attention of the committee to the matter without having consulted any of my colleagues on this side of the House, and without having discussed it with them in any way, shape or form. I have said frequently in elections that have been held in the West that, if I ever had an opportunity, I would endeavour, so far as I could, to have a list prepared that would be a final list upon which an election might be held. The primary reason for that was that I had observed during all the elections that were held while I was in the West, numbers of men brought in from the outside, in many instances gangs of workmen on railways and in some instances other men, taken to the polls, sworn in and their ballots put into the box, although their names were not on the list. They left immediately after having voted, and to know exactly where they resided would be a somewhat difficult proposition. That condition of affairs grew up in the West, because in the first instance, as in all other unorganized territories, all that was necessary for a man to do to enable him to vote was to go up and swear his vote in. In the early days in the Northwest Territories, all a man had to do was to swear that he had lived twelve months in the Northwest Territories and three months in the particular electoral district, and his ballot was put into the box and he went away. I will give a well-known case. It occurred before I went West, but it has been authenticated. Certain people gathered together a couple of hundred men and they voted them four times at four different polls. This happened before 1896. They put the men on a train and took them to one poll and voted them there. Then they put them on the train again and took them to another poll and voted them there, and so on, so that there were between 700 and 800 votes polled at four different places, but the voters were all the same 200 men. All they had to do was to swear their votes in and drop their ballots into the box. In due time enumerators were appointed. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is wrong in his statement. The enumerators do sit as a court of revision. Under the law as it now stands, as soon as a writ is issued, the returning officer under certain conditions appoints enumerators; but if he does not do that, prior to the date of the issue of the writ, the Governor in Council may appoint enumerators. An enumerator may sit for one polling division or for three or four. What is his duty? Before commencing to discharge it, he has to take an oath that he will do his duty, and put on the list the name of every person in his polling district who has lived twelve months, say in the province of Al-

berta and three months in the electoral district. He is then compelled to post up a copy of the list in the post office and to put at the foot of it a notice saying that he will sit two hours a day, naming the time and the place, for the purpose of revising the list. He must certify to that list and send it to the returning officer for the district before the hour of eight o'clock on the morning of the election, in order that it may be completed. I think it was not the immediate predecessor of the present Minister of Justice who put section 65 into the Act. Section 65 reads:

> Every voter shall be entitled to vote, whose name is on the voters' list and has not been erased therefrom, in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Part.

In other words, as the law now stands, the list itself is to be taken as conclusive proof of the voter's right to vote. That section was put upon the Statute Book, I think, about 1903 or 1904. As regards this provision there is no man living in the West, who desires to have a clean, decent election who does not know that it means just the opposite of a clean, decent election. I appeal to my hon. friend for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). Has he not seen many men brought in to a district and kept at a hotel overnight and taken up to a polling station next day and voted? That is a bad thing for the body politic and a bad thing for democracy. I directed the attention of the hon. member for Carleton and the hon. junior member for Halifax to these provisions, and they thought it wrong to have such provisions as those in the Statute Book.

Later, in consequence of what was said to them by their fellow-members from western Canada as to the inadequacy of proper revision of the list by enumerators without right of appeal to a district court or other judge, they felt they were doing an injustice to their friends from the West. So I say, as I said in the committee, I am not pressing it. If it is felt that it will work an injustice, and if it will prevent any man from having a vote who ought to vote, I am content that it should be withdrawn. But I do say this Parliament should not permit a Franchise Act of this kind to stand upon the statute book.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not any longer than we can help.

Mr. BENNETT: No. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has asked whether there is a list. In Saskatchewan they have a provincial list. Alberta ever since the year after it became a province has had provision for a list, but the law was not to come into force until after proclamation issued, and year after year no proclamation has issued. There could not be anything in election processes more disgraceful than that which takes place in a provincial election under the present law. There is an enumerator for each polling place, and members can imagine what takes place in a local or Dominion election. Writs are issued and a returning officer is appointed. That returning officer is immediately surrounded by the hungry seekers for some sort of office, and I am not speaking of one side more than of another. These people want to be appointed enumerators, and each presses his claim. Very often the man appointed is a violent partisan. He is the enumerator for a little district in which there are perhaps two hundred voters. He takes the oath of office, and very often proceeds to put on his list as many Liberals or as many Conservatives, according to his partisan leanings, as he can find. In my last election, by reason of that, I had to employ and pay a very large number of men to go from house to house throughout the city of Calgary to get the names of the whole population, and then go to the enumerators and see that the names that had been left off were put on. When I tell you that my own name was left off you will understand to what extremes this leaving off is carried. That may have been an accident, but I am stating what happened. Then, if in addition, you have a railroad gang brought in from British Columbia, after they have polled their votes there, to come to some particular poll in Alberta and vote there, as has been done—swearing in their votes and next morning being in British Columbia so that any attempt to pursue them for perjury is utterly futile—you will see that conditions are bad.

One word more. In section 63 of the Act it is provided that the electors shall take oath No. 1 under form Z. Having regard to the provisions of 62 and 65—I have read 65—it is apparent that sections 62, 63 and 65 are not consistent with one another. Originally, we started to make that little change, and when the discussion took place we arrived at the conclusion that it would be wise to prevent them from swearing in their votes, a provision which is now not to be proceeded with. We shall never have proper elections in Alberta unless we get a decent election

law in the province. I was only seeking to show that in their anxiety to pass section 65, the committee omitted to make the amendments necessary to make sections 62, 63 and 65 consistent. Leave the law as it is and you will have an election on the same conditions as before, much as I regret it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the hon. gentleman say that it is necessary to amend section 63 now? I wish to call his attention to the fact that apparently that section is to provide a penalty for refusing to take the oath of qualification when put to the voter.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not say that it is going to make a very great difference. But sections 62, 63 and 65, read with section 61, show some little inconsistency, although I think it can be worked out in practice as it has been in the past.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will the hon. gentleman tell me under which sections he finds provision made for the proper revision of the list?

Mr. BENNETT: There are two. Section 48 reads:

> Each such enumerator shall complete, date at his place of residence, and sign the copies of the voters' list or lists as aforesaid, in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, eight days before the polling day....
>
> In either of the said provinces, one of the places where copies of the lists are to be so posted up shall be the post office nearest to the place appointed as the polling station for the polling subdivision, or, if there is no such post office, a conspicuous place outside and adjoining the main entrance to such polling station.

That is the provision about revision of the lists.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 1—repealing provision to enable person not on list to vote in Saskatchewan and Alberta and making form Y apply to those provinces:

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg to move that the Bill be amended by striking out section 1.

Motion agreed to.

On section 2—changing list of places in which deferred elections may be held:

Mr. PROULX: I move that this Bill be amended by inserting therein the following as section 1:

> 1. Section 70 of the Dominion Election Act, chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:
>
> (h) Any person during the time he is a director of or holds, either directly or indirectly, a controlling interest in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement, expressed or implied, or any unsatisfied claim arising therefrom, with or for or against the Government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for or against any of the officers of the Government of Canada for which any public money of Canada is to be paid.

Paragraph (d) of section 70 of the Dominion Elections Act says:

> Every person directly or indirectly, alone or with any other person, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, express or implied, with or for the Government of Canada, on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the Government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, during the time he is so holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing.

Any person, therefore, having a contract with the Government, is ineligible as a candidate for election to the House of Commons, but he may be a shareholder or have a controlling interest in an incorporated company which has a contract with the Government, and still be eligible for election. When the Elections Act was first passed, business was not carried on as it is to-day. There were very few incorporated companies then, but now business is carried on mostly by joint stock companies.

Mr. HENDERSON: Is this proposed amendment part of the Bill which the hon. member introduced a few days ago?

Mr. PROULX: Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: Then I submit that the hon. gentleman is out of order in moving an amendment which embodies provisions contained in a Bill already on the Order Paper.

Mr. PROULX: If the hon. Minister of Justice wants to adopt my amendment, I shall be glad to hand it over to him, or I can have the order discharged for the second reading of the Bill standing in my name. I do not think the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) should take advantage of a technicality in order to rule out an amendment which I think is a proper one.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the point of order raised by the hon. member for Halton is well taken, because the hon. member for Prescott admits that there is on the Order

Paper a measure standing in his name, which is the same as the amendment which he proposes to this Bill.

Mr. PROULX: There is a provision in the Senate and House of Commons Act which secures the independence of members of this House; I think the independence of candidates for elections should be secured also.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not understand that in the Senate and House of Commons Act there is at the present time any provision analogous to the provision which the hon. gentleman wants to introduce into this Bill.

Mr. PROULX: A few days ago I presented the Bill standing in my name, but as hon. gentlemen opposite have control of the proceedings of this House I suppose it will be impossible for my Bill to reach its second reading this session. In order to put this provision into effect, however, the Elections Act could be amended first, and the Senate and House of Commons Act afterwards. I would point out that the hon. Minister of Justice adopted the principle of two Bills, in the names of the hon. member for Guysborough and the hon. member for Saskatoon respectively, having in view an amendment of the Criminal Code, while these Bills were on the Order Paper.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member is mistaken in that respect. The two Bills to which he refers were referred to a special committee to consider proposed amendments to the Criminal Code, and they came back inserted in a Bill which that committee reported to the House as the result of their deliberations. In this case we are dealing with a Bill that has been reported by a special committee also, and I do not at the moment quite see how I can come to the assistance of the hon. gentleman in what he is endeavouring to do. If he is out of order in proposing this amendment, I should be equally out of order in supporting it. The other Bill, which he says is the same as the proposed amendment, being on the Order Paper, and the Chairman having ruled that that puts this proposal out of order, I do not very well see how I can remedy the situation.

Mr. PROULX: It could be remedied in this way; before this Bill is read the third time, the order for the second reading of the Bill standing in my name could be discharged.

[The Chairman.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Chairman has ruled that this amendment is out of order. I am not prepared to say that the ruling is wrong, but I suggest to the hon. member for Prescott that he look the matter up and, if he is right, then he can move his amendment on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: Perhaps it might be well for us all to accept the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman and look into it more fully.

Mr. PROULX: Then the hon. minister will not press the third reading of the Bill?

Mr. DOHERTY: No. The second section is rendered necessary by the fact that the Representation Act has changed the designations of certain constituencies. Under the Elections Act as it now stands, the constituencies of Comox-Atlin, Kootenay and Yale-Cariboo are enumerated among those constituencies in which elections may be deferred. These three constituencies have been subdivided so as to each form two constituencies. It is not proposed that in all of these new constituencies deferred elections may be held, but simply in three of them, Skeena, West Kootenay and Cariboo.

Mr. OLIVER: It did not appear to me to be necessary to have a deferred election in the old constituency of Kootenay. Then why is it necessary in West Kootenay?

Mr. STEVENS: West Kootenay includes the Big Bend country, away to the north of Revelstoke and Golden, where it is difficult to get about, and it was probably that part of the old district that made it necessary to have a deferred election in Kootenay. Of course the conditions have not changed in that respect in West Kootenay.

Mr. TURRIFF: Are the three constituencies named the only three in the Dominion in which there may be deferred elections?

Mr. DOHERTY: No; under section 86 there may be deferred elections also in Chicoutimi and Saguenay, and Gaspé, in the province of Quebec.

On Section 3—extending provision re death of candidates to Alberta and Saskatchewan:

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Why is that necessary?

Mr. DOHERTY: The purpose is to assimilate the law in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan to the law as it prevails throughout the rest of the Dominion, in the event of a candidate dying

after nomination and before the close of the polls.

Mr. MARCIL: Did the committee give any consideration to the case of Gaspé? Mr. Monk, the late member for Jacques Cartier in this House, gave many facts in support of bringing Gaspé in line with other constituencies. Gaspé now has railway communication, and for the provincial election of 1897, when I had the honour of being a candidate, the nomination was made a month earlier, but the vote was taken on the same day as in the rest of the province.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have to admit that the question of Gaspé did not come before the committee. As I pointed out, the way in which the question presented itself to us was that we were bound to do something to make the description of the British Columbia constituencies correspond with their new boundaries, and we found it was not necessary to defer the elections in the whole six. It was not suggested to us that there was any change in conditions in Gaspé from those which prevailed when the present law was enacted.

Mr. MARCIL: The conditions are very much changed there. We have a daily train service right down to Gaspé Basin, and there is now telegraphic communication with the Magdalen islands. There is provision in the law for a telegraphic proclamation. But if the committee have not considered the matter I would not be prepared to make a suggestion.

On Section 4—hours of polling extended—8 a.m. to 6 p.m.:

Mr. MARCIL: In so far as the rural constituency of Quebec are concerned, this change is not at all necessary. By five o'clock all the votes have been cast, and I have heard members from Nova Scotia say that election day is the longest day in the year.

Mr. EDWARDS: I want to endorse what has been said by the hon. member (Mr. Marcil). It may be advisable to extend the hours in the cities, but I certainly think they should not be extended in the rural districts. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has expressed my views precisely.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In justice to the special committee, I must say that this clause, as printed, is really not the recommendation of the committee. During the sittings of the committee, we were approached by representatives of railway organizations, who asked us to make amendments to the Dominion Elections Act, if it were possible, whereby greater facilities for voting could be afforded to that class of electors. Many suggestions were made and considered, but the committee found difficulties attaching to them all. We did consider last session the propriety of affording railway men an opportunity to vote during 24 or 48 hours preceding the day of polling. The idea was that polling booths should be placed at divisional points, but eventually we considered that impracticable. We also considered the suggestion of having the polling booths in cities open for a greater number of hours than is now provided by statute. There were difficulties connected with that suggestion too, although it might possibly be worked out. Then it was thought that we might meet the requests of a great number of railway voters by extending the hours of voting from eight in the morning until a later hour than five in the afternoon. The committee were not at all agreed upon the matter, and at last we concluded to put this section in the Bill, leaving it open to the House to consider. So this clause is not the recommendation of the committee, but was put in more for the purpose of securing an expression of opinion from the House generally as to what should be done.

Mr. NESBITT: In what way would it assist railway men to extend the hours from eight in the morning until after five in the evening? It is very seldom that any votes to speak of are polled in the small cities after four o'clock. In towns like that in which I live, we generally have the vote all polled before five o'clock.

Mr. PROULX: I think this provision will be a good thing in certain parts of the country. For instance, workingmen may work during the noon hour and get off an hour earlier in the evening. If they got off at five o'clock they would be able to vote between five and six. I think that would accommodate a certain number of people.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL: I was one of those who appeared before the committee and suggested this, or some similar amendment. When we look at our law, we find that in the matter of polling we are very many years behind every other country situated as we are, especially as regards affording facilities to the people who live in cities or urban districts to poll their votes. Our law in that respect has never been changed, and the hours have always been

from nine in the morning until five at night. Other countries have responded to the requirements of civilization in congested districts, and extended the polling hours so as to give everybody a fair opportunity to poll his vote. Those who have ample time under the present law to poll their votes, should have regard to other people differently situated in different parts of the country, and should be willing to let the polls remain open an hour or two longer than they themselves need, in order to give their fellow citizens an opportunity of polling. England, in 1872, changed the hours to from eight in the morning until eight at night, and that is still the law in England. I have at some trouble gone through the legislation of all the states of the American Union and I think they are almost uniform in keeping the polls open for about that length of time. Australia, since 1903, has had the polls open from eight in the morning until eight at night. There is not only the difficulty about polling votes, but a more far-reaching difficulty than that. I think one-half of the corruption that takes place during an election in a city district is due to the endeavour to poll the vote between the hours at present assigned. To-day, the polls open at nine in the morning; but long before that hour mechanics and artisans, and all working people in fact, are at their work. The ordinary business man, the clerk in the bank or in the insurance office, all the assistants in the down town offices are at work by nine or thereabouts. We must not forget that to-day the urban population of Canada is very large, and I submit that those who are living in country districts should give their fellow-citizens in the cities an opportunity to poll their votes. Under the usual provincial law, a man votes in the district where he sleeps. In the city of Toronto, for instance—and I do not desire to parade Toronto before this House particularly—the great majority of people reside anywhere from two to four or six miles away from their work, and consequently have to leave their homes, close to which they vote, half an hour before they wish to arrive at their place of work. The result is that when the polls open many people have left their homes and gone to work, for they do not desire to lose part of the day, and those who go to the polls see this spectacle: ten, fifteen or thirty men lined up outside the booth, waiting on the convenience of the deputy returning officer, who does not let them in until nine. Are elections held for the convenience of the people or for the convenience of the deputy returning officer? I think the time has come when the polling booths in cities should be open from eight in the morning until eight at night. The ordinary man does not leave his work before five oclock, the working-man at all events, and at five the polls close. If the man is going to get in his vote, he has to rush back to the neighborhood in which he lives, and that takes some time. That is the condition in Toronto and other cities throughout Canada, and I leave it to the judgment of the House whether I am correct or not. In thickly-congested districts, there is one rush to get the vote out. In large cities there is a line of motor-cars waiting at the factory doors to carry voters to the polls. We can form our own opinion whether these are all volunteers or not, but there they are, waiting to take the voters to the polls, and all sorts of influence is used with the proprietors of factories to get them to let some of their men out and to keep some of them in, according to what their political complexion is supposed to be.

Take the example that was mentioned by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). Railway people, commercial travellers and men of that kind are given no opportunty in the morning to poll their votes because they are put on trains, they have to go outside and make their daily runs, they do not, as a rule, come back until after five o'clock, and then the polls are closed against them. An election only takes place one in three, four or five years. Every civilized country I know of keeps the polls open very much longer than we do here. The present condition is wholly unsuited to cities. It leads to corruption, it leads to the bribing of men to go to the polls or to remain away, and tends very greatly to increase the corruption arising from the employing of teams and vehicles to drive men to the polls. The matter contained in this amendment is a subject that I have introduced in this House on many occasions. I have not succeeded in accomplishing anything as yet, but as the country grows, and as we find city people becoming the higher percentage of the whole, so grows the need of legislation of this kind. It has been asked for by the labouring classes of Canada. I do not want to burden people who do not want the polls kept open until later. It might be arranged by the committee that in rural districts the polls shall remain open during the present hours,

but that as far as cities are concerned, and ridings of which cities form a part, the polls should be kept open at least from eight in the morning until six at night. These hours are short enough. In the Old Country they find it necessary to close the polls at eight o'clock at night, but as recently as 1913 an amendment was made in the election law extending the time for closing the polls to nine o'clock at night if either candidate or his agent so asks. It is found there that even eight o'clock is not long enough, and the polls are to remain open from seven a.m. until nine p.m. if either candidate or his agent asks for it.

Mr. CARVELL: Where is that?

Mr. MACDONELL: Chapter 6, Imperial Acts, 1913. Since 1872 they have had the polls open from eight in the morning until eight at night. In 1913 they passed an amendment permitting either candidate to request that the polls be opened at seven o'clock and be kept open until nine o'clock at night, showing the growth and tendency of the present age to offer every facility for a man to poll his vote. I think there is nothing more that I could say that would be new on the subject. The matter is before the committee. As I say, this change is needed in cities. If our friends in the rural districts do not want this amendment to the Act, doubtless the committee might think it well to permit the polls in the rural districts to remain open in accordance with the present hours and to remain open in cities at least from eight to six.

Mr. HAZEN: Would the hon. gentleman tell the committee if in Australia they have plural voting?

Mr. MACDONELL: They have proportional representation and several classes of voting there.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The riding from which I come has a very large railway vote and the inadequacy of the present law to enable the railway vote to be polled has repeatedly been brought to my attention. I certainly am in favour of the extension of the hours of polling. If I could make a suggestion based on my experience, it would be to open the poll as early as six o'clock in the morning in these districts even if it were closed somewhat earlier in the evening. If the poll were opened in cities at six o'clock in the morning voters could go to the poll before going to the work. Another thing that I think would ease the situation is this: Saturday is becoming more and more a public holiday in this country especially for artisans and those who work in factories. If we had the election on Saturday or Monday the great bulk of the voters made up of commercial travellers would get their votes recorded. Many of them now miss the opportunity of voting. They are very sore about that and they have repeatedly called public attention to the fact that they are deprived of their vote. Another thing that could be done would be for the Railway Commission to take charge of the running of all trains,—perhaps some passenger trains—delay them for an hour at the point of starting, and allow the men who wish to do so to vote. In that way a great many votes might be recorded. We must do something in the way of giving these people who are not able to vote now an opportunity to vote. The selection of Saturday—Saturday preferably—or Monday, as the day of voting would do a great deal to remove the present inconvenience. There is no reason why election day should not be the most sacred day in this country. I admire what the French people do in making the recording of their votes practically a religious duty with the people and they vote on Sunday because every person has an opportunity of voting on that day. It might not suit the genius of our people here to have a law such as that but it would be in the line of progress and in line with what they are doing in other countries if we had at least a half holiday on election day and in cities the most convenient day for that half holiday would be Saturday or Monday. If we laid down the principle that we would have our election day either on Saturday or Monday a great many railway men and commercial travellers would have an opportunity of voting for they could go to the polls early in the morning and record their votes.

Mr. EDWARDS: Would my hon. friend delay trains an hour?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: Passenger trains?

Mr. MACLEAN: I did not say passenger trains. I said that I would like the railway commission to take charge of divisional points, and the despatch of freight trains from divisional points and delay them probably for an hour or hasten them so that the men would get their votes polled. It is easy to speed up trains, it is often done and the men would get their votes

polled in that way. But the biggest relief, without any great widening of the law, would be to open earlier in the morning and have the election on Saturday preferably to any other day in the week. It is now largely a half holiday and if we had the election on Saturday the people could go to the polls and have their votes recorded. It is the desire of a great many people to see a change in the law inasmuch as they now lose their votes. Anybody who has been identified with elections, and who has taken part in them, must see that, especially in the larger cities, there is a substantial grievance among large sections of the voters that they are not able to record their votes because of the limited time in which the polls are open, and also the inconvenience caused by the particular day selected.

Mr. BLAIN: I think it will be a surprise to most of the members of this House that any suggestion should be made to extend the hours of polling in rural districts. For my part, I have had some experience in elections and I do not recollect one suggestion from any voter in a rural district that the time should be extended for the opening or closing of the polls. I think a good deal can be said, and already a good deal has been submitted to the committee for consideration, in favour of the proposition that in the larger cities, such as Montreal, Toronto, and possibly other cities in the Dominion, longer hours for polling would be better but for the great mass of the constituencies, which are rural constituencies. I do not think that there has been any suggestion by any of the rural members in support of a proposal of this kind and I was very glad to learn from the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that this was not the matured judgment of the committee, but rather that they were reporting it to the House for its consideration. I would be disposed to think that if such a change in the law were made universal in Canada, applying it to rural districts as well as to cities, the people would be very much opposed to it and feel that it would be a change for the worse rather than for the better.

Mr. CARVELL: As I was a member of the committee, perhaps it might be wise for me to give this committee some idea of the many propositions brought before us from time to time. Many claims were advocated, especially by railway men. We had representations from, I think, the Trades and Labour Council, or at any rate, some body representing railway men, and they presented this proposition in a very strong light. There was a proposal that we open the divisional points the day before an election. I was very sorry the committee did not see its way clear to accept that proposition and work it out. Possibly my personal experience may have led me to be particularly sympathetic along that line, because I had the unpleasant experience of seeing many men put out of my constituency on election day, so that it was impossible for them to register their vote. Possibly other hon. members here have had a like experience. A large number of railway men are not able to cast their votes on election day. It was suggested that, if a box could be arranged for at each divisional point and kept open from noon of the day prior to the election until the close of the election, 90 per cent of the railway men would have the right to vote. An objection was raised to that. Suppose you had only a dozen railway votes at a particular railway point, and the majority voted one way, you would eliminate the idea of secrecy of the ballot. The railway men themselves, however, did not consider that an objection. They were willing to accept all the burdens provided that they had the right to vote.

In justice to myself I may say that I was not able to be present at the last three or four sittings of the committee, being engaged on other committees. The last time I was present at a meeting of this committee, a suggestion was made that seemed a very reasonable one. It was that there should be a provision that the Governor in Council should have the power to decide whether or not the hour should be extended from six o'clock in the morning until eight o'clock in the evening in all cities of Canada having a population of a given amount, I think 100,000.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: And railway divisional points.

Mr. CARVELL: I am told that the committee at a later session turned that suggestion down, because they felt that in some way the Governor in Council might be charged with not exercising the best discretion. It was perhaps putting an unfair discretion on the Governor in Council. I could not see any harm in that suggestion, because it would give Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and Vancouver the right to take advantage of that provision. If 100,000 was thought too great, the minimum might

be lowered to 75,000. We also discussed the question of giving the right to towns of 50,000; but there are a great many towns in Canada which have a population of 50,000 and which also have country districts incorporated with the cities. Take the city and county of St. John. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) knows that in his constituency there are voters living very nearly 100 miles away from the city of St. John. In the county of Halifax there are voters living some forty or fifty miles away from the city. Therefore we found difficulties in all those cases. It seems to me that some scheme might be worked out by placing the limit at 75,000, and giving the Governor in Council the right to state the electoral districts in which the hours of polling should be extended. I am very much in sympathy with the statement put forward by my hon. friend the member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), because from my experience of a little town of 4,000 or 5,000, I can quite realize the difficulty of polling a vote in a large city. I can also realize some of the expense entailed on candidates and committee men in getting people from great distances to the polling stations. That difficulty is obviated to some extent in section 5, which reads as follows:

> Every employer shall on polling day give every voter in his employ at least one additional hour for voting other than the noon hour.

That would get around the difficulty to some extent, but still I realize that it does not obviate the difficulty altogether, and that there is a great rush to try to poll the labour vote in big districts within the prescribed time. We discussed another proposition, that in all the cities of say 25,000 or 30,000 or 40,000 or upwards, we might extend the time of polling in the city portion of the constituency to seven or eight o'clock, and allow the country portion of the constituency to close its polls at five, as at present.

Mr. HENDERSON: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend says "hear, hear"; but let us argue the other side of the question. Let us take the city of Halifax as an illustration. The poll closes at five o'clock. There are telephones throughout the country. The consequence will be that at six o'clock you will know the results of the polling in the whole county of Halifax, and we shall say it is a tie or practically a tie, and that there is one or two hours left to poll the remainder of the votes. The number of votes left would not be very great, and we were afraid —and it is the experience of every man here, and we have all had experience of elections—that there might be redoubled efforts on the part of committee men to poll the votes in the last hour or two. All these matters were considered very carefully by the committee, and we could see some strong reasons against them all unless we made them general. I quite agree with the decision come to by the committee to make a recommendation to the House in order to bring the matter up for discussion; but, personally, I would like to see something done by which the Governor in Council would have the power to extend the time in big cities and allow the remainder of the districts, both rural and urban, to vote within the prescribed hours as at present provided. Certainly in all rural constituencies from eight o'clock in the morning until five o'clock in the afternoon is ample time. In some cases the people, long before five o'clock, are waiting for the hour to come.

Mr. BURNHAM: My instructions are quite different, and they are to ask for an extension of the hours for polling. I listened to the discussion with a great deal of interest, in fact, I might say, curiosity, because I wished to find out the objections to the great general principle of extending the hours of polling and enlarging the opportunity of exercising the franchise. Surely it is incumbent upon those gentlemen who object to state forcibly and clearly why they wish to restrain the opportunity of the people to exercise the franchise.

We are not discussing an Act for the suppression of corruption, but an Act permitting the exercise of the franchise, and therefore it should be as wide as possible. I am amazed at the suggestion of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). The Saturday holiday is earned by the workingman who works an hour longer each day during the week in order to get it, and I have been told by workingmen that if I thought they were going to give up that half holiday for the purpose of electing any politician, I had another think coming. That seems entirely reasonable to me. I am grieved when I think of the personnel of this committee, that they were not able to hatch up something better than this Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You are on the committee yourself.

Mr. BURNHAM: No.

Mr. CARVELL: You were called before the committee.

Mr. BURNHAM: That is different. It seems to me that if we are in such a bad state in this country that we cannot allow an extended number of hours to the people —who, so far as I know, want that extension—in order that they may reasonably exercise their franchise, then we are in a bad state indeed, especially if we believe that the demon of corruption is going about like a roaring lion. If the railway people cannot vote because they cannot get to the ballot box, let us provide more ballot boxes, but to hang up these necessary reforms because of all sorts of little tupenny ha'penny objections seems to me inconsistent with the dignity of this House.

Mr. KEMP: In the last elections held in the province of Ontario for the legislative assembly the polls were opened at eight o'clock and closed at five o'clock in the afternoon in cities of two hundred thousand population and over. That amendment was adopted, I understand, because of the growth of Toronto, which is the only city in Ontario having a population of two hundred thousand. In this country, where our cities are growing up so rapidly, and where the desire of the people is to get out into the suburbs where they may have cheaper rentals, a great many people—clerks, labouring people, employers and others—live at a distance from the centre and must spend perhaps three-quarters of an hour or an hour in going from their place of occupation to the poll where their votes must be cast. I think the time has come when an exception ought to be made in respect of cities of say two hundred thousand population or over. I would not think it desirable to extend this to rural places; but in view of the great growth of our cities and of the precedents that have been read by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) of amendments to the election laws in other places, we might very well extend the time of polling in these cities by one hour in the morning. The request was made of me that I should advocate the keeping open of the polls until six o'clock instead of five, But I would not go so far as that even with respect to cities of two hundred thousand population. If a man could vote before he goes to his place of occupation in the morning and get there by, say ten o'clock, it would be a great convenience and many more voters would cast their ballots than under the present system.

Mr. CARVELL: Does the hon. gentleman think that opening the poll at eight o'clock would be a benefit to the labouring man? I can understand how it would help clerks and others, but when it comes to the labouring man, I am afraid it would not be of much use to him.

Mr. KEMP: In the section which follows it is provided that on polling day the employer is obliged to allow the employee an hour without deduction from his wages. For the man who does not start work until eight in the morning in the regular way, it seems to me it would be a great convenience to be able to vote before nine o'clock.

9 p.m.

Mr. GRAY: For many years there was great complaint on the part of the commercial travellers regarding the days chosen for elections. There are in the neighborhood of twenty-five thousand travellers in Canada, and probably twenty per cent of them lose the opportunity to exercise their franchise.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN And they are the keenest politicians in the country.

Mr. GRAY: Yes. It has been suggested to me that if Friday could be set apart as the day of polling it would be acceptable to the travellers. The light-sample men who carry grips leave their homes on Sunday so that they may get upon the territory they have to cover on Monday morning. As to heavy sample-men, with trunks, it does not make so much difference, but they would work a little harder and a little later in order that they might get in on Friday to poll their votes. I am in accord with the hon. member for Toronto that if the polls were open at 7 o'clock, a.m., it would be of advantage to those who want to leave by an early train.

Mr. MACDONALD: I quite agree with the views expressed by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) that there has been no request from any part of the country to change the hours of polling in rural constituencies. I am rather at a loss to appreciate the argument of my hon. friend from South Toronto. It is urged that in large cities railway men and commercial travellers do not have a chance to vote, but I do not see that the proposition contained in this section offers any solution of this problem. If the commercial traveller is away from home the extension of the time of poll-

ing by an hour in the morning is of no use to him; if he is at home, he can vote as well between nine and five as he can between eight and six. So we can eliminate their case from those to be considered in this connection. As to the railway men, surely my hon friend from South York will agree that his proposal that trains be stopped to allow railway men to vote is impracticable. You cannot work out a law in regard to the operation of voting that is going to satisfy everybody. There must always be some people who have to work on that day. The idea is to have as few people as possible deprived of their franchise. The proposal of the hon. member would stand in the way of those who desire to use the trains to reach their polling places. A man may have come hundreds of miles to vote in his home constituency only to find that by reason of the dislocation of the train service through delaying trains for an hour in the morning he could not reach the poll at all. During elections the movement of voters in the country is very great, and the prompt arrival and departure of trains is of great importance. By reason of delay or disarrangement of train services, a great many people might be unable to reach the polls before they close.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: My suggestion was with regard to freight trains starting from divisional points, where the bulk of the voters live.

Mr. MACDONALD: After all, the idea is to reduce to the minimum the number of persons who are deprived of the privilege of voting. I do not believe that public sentiment favours a wholesale change in the law. In Nova Scotia—I speak of provincial elections—the polls open at eight o'clock in the morning and close at five in the afternoon; it has never been complained that the polls are not open as long as they should be. There are many railway men whose regular rounds take them from one divisional point to another point perhaps 100 miles distant, and unless the whole system of voting is disarranged, there is no way in which these men can be given an opportunity to vote. Certain people must of necessity, therefore, be debarred from the franchise. I do not say that in the case of cities the conditions could not be improved by lengthened hours of polling, but we must not confuse that phase of the matter with the proposal contained in this section, which, although put forward as a remedy, is really not a remedy for these conditions. Two hundred men can vote at any polling subdivision with the greatest ease, provided they live anywhere within ten miles of the poll. If this is done, and if every employer is required to give his employees an hour to vote, it does seem to me that whatever practical difficulties there are will be obviated. I would not favour extending the hours of polling in rural constituencies past five o'clock. The experience has been that in general elections every vote is polled in rural constituencies long before five o'clock. It is my opinion that if the polls were kept open longer, the door would be opened to drunkenness and corruption. My hon. friend's suggestion about the English election laws is not apropos of the case. In England there is no simultaneous polling.

Mr. MACDONNEL: Practically so.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not at all; a general election in Great Britain occupies a long period of time. Only one or two constituencies vote in the same day. If simultaneous polling is good, then Great Britain is very much behind us in that respect.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I do not quite catch my hon. friend's meaning. What bearing has the question of simultaneous polling upon the hours of voting?

Mr. MACDONALD: I was simply discussing whether we should go to Great Britain for instruction as to how to run elections. I was suggesting that because they have simultaneous polling over there, which most people regard as a rather retrograde condition, they are not ahead of us in this matter. Another consideration is the crowded population of the British Isles, which gives rise to a condition entirely different from that which exists in this country, comprised, as it is, of huge areas of land and a scattered population. Then again, take the conditions that exist in Great Britain in reference to the counting of the votes. Would it be practicable in this country to take all the ballot boxes from the country districts, bring them to a central place, and there count the ballots? They do that in England, and I hardly think it would be suggested that we should do that here. This only goes to show that in matters of this kind the peculiar conditions of the country concerned must be carefully considered. I do submit that there is no crying need for any radical change in the present law. Anomalies do exist, and, perhaps, can be remedied to a

certain extent, but the minority must always give way to the majority in the matter of convenience and the public interest. Personally, I would support no change in the law except the proposal to have the polls open at eight o'clock in the morning.

Mr. GLASS: Representing a rural constituency, I am opposed to any further discrimination in the matter of the franchise as between rural and urban municipalities. There is a distinction in the matter of registration in favour of the cities that is, to some extent, objectionable. The difficulty in connection with this whole matter is not so much with reference to the hours for voting, because cities, no matter how large, are subdivided into a certain number of polling subdivisions, just as the rural sections are, and if the employer assumes an attitude of fairness towards his employees and gives them an opportunity to vote, the conditions are quite in favour of their being able to register their vote. I think the best solution of the difficulty would be to provide for a half-holiday, or at least a quarter-holiday, and thus put the voter in a position where he will be absolutely untrammelled by any restrictions in the matter of exercising his franchise. It is my experience that while many employers of labour are willing to allow their employees who are favourable to their views to exercise their franchise, a veiled threat is held out to those who are not favourable to the employer's political views that if they do exercise the franchise they take the consequences upon themselves. The extra hour is absolutely of no use to the workingman where his employer wants to put restrictions on him.

Mr. MACDONELL: Why? It is the law of the land.

Mr. GLASS: I know it is the law of the land, but the man is afraid to go out to exercise his franchise.

Mr. HENDERSON: Oh, no.

Mr. GLASS: I know it, I know it from personal observation. My reason for speaking of this is that I think the section following this is very closely related to the present one. It is not so much the extra hour for polling that is important as to have a fixed time when employees shall have the right to go untrammelled to exercise that franchise. It is suggested that a certain number of men be allowed to go at one hour and a certain number at another hour in order not to inconvenience the management of the factory. I would favour having the hours for voting, if 8 o'clock is too early, from 9 until 6 p.m. I would approve of the extra hour at the latter part of the day. But I think that by closing places of business at 3 o'clock every employee would be given the opportunity to go out and vote, and I think that would overcome the whole difficulty. The hon. member from South York has suggested voting on Saturday, and the hon. member for London (Mr. Gray) has referred to the convenience of commercial men in relation to voting. We know that in municipal elections in London and in Toronto and some other places arrangements were made whereby the vote was taken on New Year's day, and the experience in our city has shown that there has been a smaller percentage of votes cast at the polls since that innovation. Consequently, voting on the holiday has been of no advantage. As to extending the hours in rural constituencies, I agree with the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) that there is no demand from rural constituencies to have extended hours; but I do not think there would be any objection to it if it were found necessary. I would much rather see the same hours exist in rural communities as in cities, so as not to have any discrimination between them. Then how are we to determine what is strictly a rural municipality? My own is a rural constituency, but I have 8,000 people from the city of London who live in the township in my constituency, mechanics and employees in the different shops and factories of London. If that were considered a rural constituency and the hours limited, the workingmen who live there would not have the same opportunity of exercising the franchise as men who live in the city. I think it would be very objectionable and I would resent it if any difference were to be made between the hours of voting as between rural and civic municipalities. I think the difficulty would be overcome if a quarter holiday or half holiday were declared and it were made a sacred duty for every man to exercise his franchise on election day.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would suggest that the chairman read clause 5 so that both clauses may be before the committee.

Section 5 read:

The following section is inserted immediately after section 136:

"136a. Every employer shall on polling day give to every voter in his employ one additional hour for voting other than the noon hour, and shall make no deduction in the pay

of such employees nor impose or exact any penalty from any employee by reason of absence during such hour.

Mr. DEVLIN: In connection with section 5, is there any penalty?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no special penalty provided by this Bill. There is, as I have no doubt the hon. member is aware, a penalty provided under a general disposition for a violation of the obligations imposed under any statutes for which no particular penalty is prescribed; and I suppose that the enforcement of this, unless we inserted a special penalty, would have to depend on that clause.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would it not be clearer if there were a penalty attached to that section. I am in favour of section 4 if no better scheme can be devised. I am in favour of giving everybody a chance to vote. I understand that in the cities the labouring classes cannot conveniently vote between the hours of 9 and 5. I would even like to see an hour earlier in the morning if that were possible, but if not I would favour the hours from 9 to 6. I would very much prefer the idea given out by the last speaker of having voting day declared a half holiday. That would serve every constituency, and in default of voting day being declared a half holiday, I would prefer to have section 5 read that instead of one hour every employer shall on voting day give every voter in his employ at least two additional hours. In some cities we know that the factories have many employees voting at one poll and that it would be practically impossible for them all to vote at the one hour.

Mr. TURRIFF: The suggestion made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to extend the hour by commencing at 8 o'clock in the morning would to my mind be the most objectionable one of all, so far as the rural constituencies of the West are concerned. It must be borne in mind that in the western provinces, during the winter months, at 8 o'clock in the morning the sun is just rising, and in stormy weather it would be dark in many parts of the West at that hour. Then very often the officers of the polling division, the deputy returning officer, the poll clerk and the scrutineers of the various candidates, may have to travel 7 or 8 or 10 miles from their homes to reach the polling booth, and therefore it would be a very great hardship to compel them to open the poll at 8 o'clock in the morning. The present hour, so far as rural constituencies are concerned, is very satisfactory; there is no demand from any part of the country for a change, and a change would be resented.

I think that my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) has made out a very good case on behalf of the cities. The suggestion of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross), that there should be a quarter or a half holiday, seems to me the most reasonable one, although I am not prepared to say just which would work out best. Election day comes on an average only once in four years, and it would be no great hardship if workingmen were allowed to go to work at ten in the morning, or to quit at three in the afternoon. It seems to me that as the polls usually cover only about 200 voters, you would in that way get over the difficulty with as little inconvenience as possible. It will be admitted, after the discussion we have had for the last half hour, that there are a great many difficulties in the way, and that it is not easy to make a law that will be absolutely satisfactory. But I think we should leave the rural constituencies alone. Personally, I am in favour of giving the workmen a quarter day's holiday, rather than of extending the time of polling by one hour. I think the holiday would overcome the difficulty with as little friction as possible.

Mr. MARCIL: This was a very live issue in Montreal two years ago. It was taken up by all the labour bodies of the city, and discussed by the city council for several weeks, and finally taken up by the Quebec Legislature, which enacted that during a municipal election in the city of Montreal the polls should open at nine in the morning and remain open until eight in the evening. I think that has given general satisfaction in the city of Montreal.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Representing as I do a rural constituency, with seven townships and ten towns, I feel I shall be carrying out the wishes of my constituents in supporting this proposition. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is opposed to the polls opening at eight in the morning, and there may be something in his objection, but certainly no good reason has been given to-night why the polls should not be kept open until six o'clock. It is true that in in the rural districts the vote is largely polled by five o'clock or before, but what serious objection can be made

to the suggestion that the deputy returning officer and the clerks should remain at the booths for an extra hour, in order to give workmen and railway men in large cities an opportunity of polling their votes? And it is not only in the large cities that men are not able to poll their votes. Cities like Chatham, or Sarnia, or Windsor, which have a large number of men at work on the railways or in the shops, would be very glad to have this law enacted, so that the men might have an opportunity of polling their votes up to six o'clock at night. I sincerely hope that clauses 4 and 5 will receive the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. KYTE: I do not understand how the suggestion of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong), that the polls be kept open until six o'clock, will enable railway men employed on trains to poll their votes. The trains do not necessarily arrive at divisional points at six o'clock; very often not until midnight. The express trains and the freight trains, particularly arrive at the different stations at different hours, according to the schedule on which they run.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: This would give them an extra hour.

Mr. KYTE: But that extra hour does not necessarily give them an opportunity to vote, because if the trains do not arrive until seven the train hands will have no more opportunity of voting than at present. With regard to the suggestion that a half-holiday be proclaimed on election day, I think it would lead to congesting the voters in the later hours of the afternoon, and this congestion would make it more difficult for them to poll their votes during the afternoon than if they had the whole day in which to vote. It does appear to me that if there is to be a holiday declared on election day, it should be the whole day. Or the holiday should be given in the forenoon, so that the men could record their votes in the morning. There is always a certain number of electors who will not poll their votes in the morning. They prefer to come to the poll in the afternoon, and then they remain at the booth and get the results before they leave for home. If in addition to these men who naturally postpone their vote until the afternoon, we are to have all the labouring-men who are employed in the district where the votes are to be recorded, we shall have a congestion of votes in the afternoon, which will render it quite impossible for them all to record their votes, even before six o'clock. It is quite true that some voters are debarred from the opportunity of voting by reason of the fact that the polls close at five o'clock in the afternoon. Still, I am quite aware of the fact that if the polls remained open until midnight, there would be still some two or three or more voters who would be late in recording their votes. When they have all day to record them they take their time about it, and I do know that in rural polling subdivisions where there is only a small number of votes to be recorded, there are always two or three or more men who come just in time to see the key turned in the lock, and themselves prevented from entering to record their votes.

The committee which had charge of the revision of the Elections Act entered upon their duties with a desire to remove, as far as possible, all the difficulties that stand in the way of a voter recording his vote. In addition to those classes which have been mentioned this evening, there is another class of voters who very frequently are unable to record their votes. But the difficulty which prevents them cannot be met by any legislation that I can conceive of. I refer to the large number of deep-sea fishermen who are engaged in the prosecution of the deep-sea fisheries in Nova Scotia. There are in the county of Lunenburg, I am sure, a thousand voters who are employed in the deep-sea fisheries fleet every year, and when an election takes place at any time between the first of May and the first of November these men have not the privilege of recording their votes. They are an intelligent portion of the voting community in the province of Nova Scotia, and we should all like to see them exercising the franchise with the same regularity as the electors who are otherwise employed. I would not venture to suggest that this committee could think out any feasible scheme by which these men could be permitted to record their votes, unless there was some sort of a roving commission appointed, to go out with ballot boxes to the fishermen so that they could record their votes. But in view of a suggestion in another direction, which we have had from the committee, and which we shall be called upon to deal with before very long, I am still hopeful that perhaps we can arrive at some means by which the fishermen engaged in the deep-sea fisheries may also have an opportunity of recording their votes:

Mr. PARDEE: As long as I have had the opportunity of looking into the various kinds of legislation regarding voting that have been proposed either in this House or in other legislatures, it has appeared to me that very many suggestions have come forward, but that after all you cannot get very much better results than you have under the present Act. Somebody is always bringing forward some new suggestion, like those contained in the present Bill. In regard to this section 4, which says that " the polls shall be opened at the hour of eight of the clock in the forenoon and kept open until six of the clock in the afternoon," I say that, so far as rural districts are concerned, there is absolutely no sense or reason for that amendment and that in so far as urban municipalities are concerned, there is still less sense.

Read section 4 in conjunction with section 5, which says that at least one additional hour for voting, other than the noon hour, shall be given by each employer without any deduction from the employee's wages. If you legislate that there shall be a half-holiday, that if and so shall be done in order to facilitate, and give longer hours for, voting, it simply means, when you get down to the last analysis, that you have less organization for polling your vote, and you do not do any better than if you had the shorter time.

Mr. MACDONELL: That is from the politician's standpoint, not from the public standpoint.

Mr. PARDEE: That is absolutely from the commonsense standpoint, and my hon. friend ought to know that. I think I have been in politics as long as he has and know as much about them.

Mr. MACDONELL: I am paying a tribute to the hon. gentleman's knowledge of politics.

Mr. PARDEE: I was trying to pay a tribute to my hon. friend's commonsense. If you have a half-holiday, what do you find?—men knocked out of work, congestion of voters during the last hour, or half-hour, at the polls, and the very thing that you have tried to guard against you are up against in a worse form than before. To the two hours to be given to employees on voting day I have no objection. If you give employees in the larger cities from 12 to 2, those who work in wards a considerable distance from their own polling subdivisions will have a chance to go to the polls and vote. It is easier to get there in two hours than in one hour. If you extend the hours of voting you simply reach the result that, while more time is given to bring in the vote, less organization takes place, everybody puts off what might be done that minute, votes will be polled during the last hour, or at the last minute, and you will be as far short as you were before. In the rural municipalities there is no call whatever for an extension of the voting hours. In urban municipalities I doubt very much if there is any demand for such an amendment to the law, and I believe that we can get along just as well in the future as we have in the past, and that the time between the hours of nine and five is quite sufficient to poll the votes, provided you have the necessary organization. You would be no better off with the extra hours and with the extra hours you simply have less organization to get the vote to the polls, and there would be as many votes polled at the last minute as there are now. For these reasons, it does appear to me that although this committee has considered this Bill, and I have no doubt considered it very carefully, we might very well leave the hours of voting as they are to-day, but if the House, or the committee sees fit we might set apart the hours from 12 to 2 for voting. Outside of that we had better leave the whole Act as it is, and not bring in these amendments.

Mr. BLAIN: I do not understand the Act to mean what my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) has stated in so far as it requires the employer to give the employee an opportunity to vote. The Bill says:

> Every employer shall on polling day give to every voter in his employ at least one additional hour for voting other than the noon hour, and shall make no deduction in the pay of such employees, nor impose or exact any penalty from any employee by reason of absence during such hour.

I do not understand this, to mean that the employee shall be free from one to two o'clock. I do not think that would be a very good thing. It means that the employer shall give to the employees some time during polling hours an extra hour to go to the polls. It does not mean that the employees shall have the right to the hour between one and two o'clock. We would have the same difficulty from congestion at the polls between one and two o'clock if that were the meaning of the section and that would not be in the public interest nor would it assist in polling the votes.

Mr. PROULX: It means any time of the day?

Mr. BLAIN: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: I think that the hour between five and six o'clock would be a very convenient time for the working man.

Mr. BLAIN: There is no fixed hour whatever; it means whatever hour will suit them.

Mr. BALL: I come from a constituency which is partly rural and partly urban. Personally, and speaking from observation, I think that the hours from nine to five o'clock are very reasonable hours and that they are all right. I think a half holiday would be an improvement where labour is employed. It would be well for the men to be set free from all influences of the employer for at least half a day. In some places the men are let out perhaps in ones and twos and they go to the poll under very peculiar influences. It would be well if they were given a half holiday and allowed to do as they pleased. With regard to the day of the election, it has been the custom for some time past to hold municipal elections on Monday and I think that is a very good day. It would be a good day for Dominion elections also. Commercial travellers are at home over Sunday as a rule and they could remain at home and poll their votes on Monday before leaving. I think that every man in this country who has a vote ought to be obliged to poll that vote. It would get rid of a great deal of difficulty in the matter of canvassing and that kind of work. I therefore would approve of a half holiday on the afternoon of election day and I would suggest that the hours continue to be from nine o'clock to five o'clock which I think are very reasonable and give a long enough time for the purpose of polling the vote. If the Government saw fit it would be well to have Monday set apart as election day.

Mr. MACDONELL: Every hon. gentleman who has risen to oppose this measure admitted before he sat down that it was right in principle. I do not think there is any hon. gentleman who has opposed this Bill who has not at some stage of the discussion suggested something in the way of greater latitude in voting. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ball) goes farther than any of those who spoke before him. He says that he is in favour of a half holiday and of compulsory voting. I commend the hon. gentleman for that opinion. It is my opinion. I have introduced compulsory voting legislation into the House in other days for the sole reason that it would practically obliterate ninety-nine per cent of electoral corruption. If men have to go to the poll they will go and vote without being carried there, or without being paid to go there, and they will not remain away because they are paid to remain away. Nothing would purify the election atmosphere so much as compulsory voting, but I realize that is not a proposal which will find acceptance in this country at the present time. Every hon. gentleman who has opposed this Bill has said something in its favour. I commend the opinion of my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin). I think he is quite right in more senses than one. The hon. gentleman, without mentioning it, quoted the Ontario law which gives two hours during election day to enable employees to vote. He also commended the idea of giving a portion of the day as a holiday. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) did not seem to see any reason for this legislation. It is suggested that he cannot see anything, but sometimes he is pretty wide awake. I want to tell the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who is a very reasonable gentleman, that in the city of Toronto, notwithstanding what my hon. friend would call the herculean efforts of the great Tory party in that city, and notwithstanding the efforts made by both parties, we poll on an average of only from 60 to 65 per cent of the total vote. There are about 50,000 or 60,000 voters in that city. In the last election in the riding of South Toronto, which I have the honour to represent, the vote polled was only a little over 60 per cent of the total vote.

Mr. ROGERS: You had enough?

Mr. MACDONELL: I had enough for the occasion.

Mr. PARDEE: If you had needed the rest, you would have had it polled.

Mr. MACDONELL: You never can tell, until after an election is over, how you stand. Very much the greater portion of that 40 per cent of the vote that is not polled is not polled because there are no sufficient opportunities or facilities given to the people to poll their votes. In the district of Toronto referred to, part of which is represented by my hon. friend the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), there is a population of three-quarters of

a million people, and it is impossible for them, residing as they do at very great distances from their work, to poll their votes during business hours. The section that follows is not sufficient to afford relief, because the one hour that is given is not enough. The experience of the Ontario Government has been that at least two hours are needed in cities to give men an opportunity to get back to their residential districts for the purpose of voting. The legislation has been progressive there; and as pointed out by my hon. friend the member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), the Ontario Government has recently enacted that, in cities of 200,000, the polls shall open at eight o'clock in the morning. Who is hurt in a city, if the polls are opened at eight o'clock in the morning and kept open until six o'clock at night? Even in the country, people would not be hurt.

Mr. MARCIL: What are the hours for polling in municipal elections in Toronto?

Mr. MACDONELL: They were changed recently. I understand the polls are open until six o'clock now.

Mr. MARCIL: In Montreal they are kept open until eight o'clock.

Mr. MACDONELL: And that is not too long to keep them open. If men get an opportunity to vote, they will vote, and the expense of taking them to the polls will not be necessary. I appeal to the committee to make reasonable and fair provision for people in the city districts, who number now quite forty per cent of the total population of the Dominion. If section 4 is allowed to pass with a proper amendment so as to exclude the country districts, the committee will be doing justice to all parties.

Section negatived.

Mr. MACDONELL: I beg to move the following amendment to section 4:

Provided that in cities having a population of over 200,000, and in ridings formed in part by a portion or portions of such cities, the polls shall be opened in every polling place at eight o'clock in the forenoon and shall be kept open until five o'clock in the afternoon of the same day and the vote shall be by ballot.

This amendment amounts to practically nothing, and I hope it will be adopted unanimously by the committee. It is simply the Ontario law applied to cities of 200,000 people and upwards. It applies to only two or three cities in Canada, which are very congested districts. Relief will be given, and the polls will close uniformly throughout Canada at five o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. MARCIL: The time is not the same throughout Canada and the results are known in Halifax while voting is going on in the West. It is no relief to the city people to open the polls earlier in the morning. If you want to give them relief, you will have to keep the polls open until later in the evening. That is the mature judgment of the Montreal Labour Council and of all the labour organizations of the cities.

Mr. DEVLIN: Why not say "in the cities of Canada?"

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) carried that amending clause, a constituency partly rural and partly urban would incur a very serious difficulty. It might happen that 95 per cent of his polling districts within that electoral district would close at five, and the result be known before, say, half-past five or a quarter to six.

Mr. MACDONELL: The hon. gentleman has not grasped the purpose of the amendment. It is that in all cities, or in ridings that are formed in part by city districts the polls shall open at eight o'clock and close at five o'clock.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is what I am speaking about. I am pointing out the serious objection that 95 per cent of the polling stations of one electoral district close at five and the other 5 per cent at six.

Mr. MACDONELL: The same closing hour applies to any riding that includes in part or whole a city of 200,000 or over.

Mr. DOHERTY: In the first place, this amendment is going to make the law in two cities in Canada different from the law for the rest of the country. That is not an insuperable objection, but it is an undesirable thing unless, by the differentiation, you are going to get a very substantial advantage for some class of the people. Speaking for myself, I have very strong sympathy with what was put forward on behalf of the railway and the workingmen, and I believe that we ought to do what we can to make it possible for both these classes to vote absolutely independently, without any question of asking time and taking time and so forth. While my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) says that he regretted that the committee were not disposed to take up and work out the proposition of the railway men, I do not think that exactly describes the

action of the committee. The committee were disposed to take the question up, and my memory is that they took it up and that they endeavoured to work it out on a practical basis; but they could not find a method by which the railway men could vote the day previous to election day, which was the suggestion they put forward. It was considered that, failing that, a substantial advantage might come to them by opening the polls at an earlier hour in the morning, and the hour suggested was six o'clock or half-past six o'clock in the morning, so as to enable the men to vote before they went to the stations. This would also have enabled a large number of the labouring classes to vote before they went to their work. The reason given for lengthening the hours does not seem to me the important one. It is not that you want more hours of polling, but you want the polls open at the time when the people are best able to vote. From the point of view of the cities, if you are going to allow the workingman to vote before he goes to work in the morning, you would have to open the polls before seven o'clock. I do not see how it is going to help the workingman to open the polls at eight o'clock.

Mr. PARDEE: But if he has two hours in the middle of the day, would not that do it?

Mr. DOHERTY: That comes under a different section. I was pointing out certain considerations in relation to this particular proposal. I do not know how it is in the rural constituencies, but in Montreal the workingman goes to work at seven o'clock. By opening the poll at eight you might help the clerks and others who go to their offices at nine, but the change would not help the workingman. The great difficulty in the cities is that if a man does not vote before he goes to his business, or finds the poll closed when he returns from his business, he must make a special trip over a long distance from his place of occupation to the place where he polls his vote in the subdivision in which he resides. It will be a great benefit, it seems to me, to provide a time, what we may call a free time, for the voter when he can poll his vote, and thus obviate the necessity of conveying him to the poll.

Mr. PARDEE: It is only once in four years he is called upon to vote and he is not very seriously inconvenienced.

Mr. DOHERTY: I know; but what I am pointing out is that the section as proposed does not fulfil the purpose for which it is intended so far as the cities are concerned.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: It is for you to assume the responsibility of doing that.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is for the House; I cannot impose my power upon the House; it is essentially a matter for Parliament to pronounce upon. I do not think it would be fair for me, even if I could, to impose my will upon the members of the House.

The effect of the suggested amendment of the hon. member for South Toronto is to make a different law for these two cities out of the whole Dominion. It does not seem to me to gain the advantage which we wish to gain. My own constituency is substantially a workingman's constituency, and I have a large railway men's vote. It will not help these voters to give them an hour extra in the morning by making the polls open at eight o'clock. The workingman is at work before eight o'clock, and he will not gain by the extension of an hour. No doubt it would be of some advantage to the class of people who go to their offices at nine, but I do not see that that advantage is sufficient to make it worth while to differentiate between these cities and the rest of the country.

10 p.m.

Mr. MACDONELL: The minister criticises my amendment because it does not put the hour's increase of time at the end of the day. That motion was before the Chair and did not receive support.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am more or less sympathetic with the desire of the hon. member for South Toronto. I do not think that anybody, on the abstract question of whether the polls shall open at seven or eight in the morning and continue open until six in the evening, could make a successful argument against it. It is not an argument against the polls being open from seven o'clock a.m. until six o'clock p.m. that all the votes are polled by five o'clock. On the other hand, I admit there is no apparent necessity for this change, so far as the rural districts are concerned. I am inclined to agree with the Minister of Justice in regard to the amendment of the hon. member for South Toronto; it will accomplish very little if anything to open the polls at eight in the morning. If it were six o'clock—

Mr. MACDONELL: I will change it to six if the hon. member will support it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have not suggested that. As the amendment would

appear to accomplish so little, I think we might as well have the section as it is at present.

Amendment (Mr. Macdonell) negatived.

Mr. MACDONELL moved:

That section 5 be amended by substituting the words "two hours" for "hour."

He said: I am open for any suggestion so long as the facilities for voting are increased, and they have not been increased so far. I desire to call attention to the Ontario Act. This is chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1914, section 112. It is well worded and has worked out well:

A voter entitled to vote within a city or town shall, on the day of polling be entitled to absent himself for the purpose of voting from any service or employment in which he is then engaged or employed, from the hour of noon until the hour of two of the clock next thereafter, and a voter shall not, because of his so absenting himself, be liable to any penalty, or suffer or incur any reduction from the wages or compensation to which but for his absence he would have been entitled, but this section shall not apply where a voter is by his employer permitted or allowed at any other period during the hours of polling, reasonable and sufficient time and opportunity to vote.

This is an exceedingly fair and just provision.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In what year was that introduced?

Mr. MACDONELL: Seven or eight years ago. It amply protects the voter against unfair discrimination on the part of the employer, and it does not apply if the employer gives the employee ample time at any other time to vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: Is that not the substance of the provision contained in this proposed legislation? We give the employee an hour in addition to the noon hour.

Mr. MACDONELL: Nowadays, as the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) remarked, workmen work an hour more each day in order to get a half-holiday on Saturday, and the consequence is that in many cases they do not get an hour for lunch at noon. The Ontario legislation gives the employee two definite hours; I commend the language of this section to the consideration of the committee.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Ontario legislation gives two definite hours, but only if the employer does not give his employee sufficient time at some other hour of the day. We say simply that the employer shall give these two hours. Suppose I am an employer, and I say to my employee you cannot get from 12 until 2 o'clock, but I will give you an hour at another time, then, if that is a sufficiently long time for him to go to vote, I shall be perfectly right, under the Ontario statute, and no complaint can be made. We are saying in effect, but in shorter form, the same thing, because we say: you shall give the employee an hour besides the noon hour. If the employee does not take the noon hour, that is his own affair. In drawing this provision we had the Ontario section before us, and we thought we had adopted the Ontario section, but in simpler form.

Mr. MACDONELL: Only as to one hour.

Mr. DOHERTY: When you say one hour in addition to the noon hour, that is two hours.

Mr. MACDONELL: That is not what the Bill says.

Mr. DOHERTY: It says that the employer shall give to every voter in his employ at least one additional hour for voting, other than the noon hour. If any other words will make the meaning clearer, I shall be glad to adopt them. If the employee chooses to agree with his employer that he shall not take the noon hour, I do not see that we should be called upon to say that he shall get some other hour than that. He makes his own bargain with his employer about the noon hour. Really I think there may be a question as to the desirability of fixing specific hours, but I only want to point out that the Ontario legislation does not do that any more than this does.

Mr. PARDEE: The object of this legislation is to provide that the voter shall have a chance to vote. I take it that everybody wants to make it just as easy for the voter to vote as it is possible to make it. Taking into consideration the fact that you must have in the first place, the voter's interest, and that it is desired to give the employee a chance to vote, irrespective of what his employer may think, would it not be well to provide that the hours during which the employee may vote on election day shall be from twelve o'clock noon until two p.m.

Mr. DOHERTY: That might create a situation in which many industries would have to close during the remainder of the day, because all employees would go out at the same time.

Mr. OLIVER: Will this hour be chosen by the employer, or by the employee?

Mr. DOHERTY: The obligation of the employer is to give the employee an hour other than the noon hour, and it would seem to be a fair thing that the employer should fix the hour that is most suitable. At all events, that is the effect of the section.

Mr. MACDONELL: My apprehension was that the hour that is mentioned here as the noon hour is referred to only inferentially; the provision is not as clear as the provision of the Ontario Act. The difficulty, which is rather more deep-seated than has been suggested by the minister, is that while the Ontario Act makes provision for a man's having two hours of his employer's time once in every three, four or five years, the hour spoken of in this Bill at the noon hour is a period of time contributed by the employee himself.

That is he is out a part of it; he is paid by the hour usually and he is out the time he is not working; so that all he gets, so far as he gets anything gratis under this Bill, is one hour given to him in addition to his noon hour.

Mr. PARDEE: Would that not be fair after all?

Mr. MACDONELL: I think all he gets by this Bill is the one hour. That seems to be the intention of the committee and of the minister.

Mr. DOHERTY: One hour besides the noon hour.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: I would suggest an addition to subsection 6. There is a very great employer of labour in eastern Canada to which the section would not apply except by express enactment, and that is the Government railway system. I have hurriedly drafted an amendment:

This section shall apply to the Government railway system and to all employees thereof except to those the performance of whose duties are necessary to the operation of the regular trains.

Mr. COCHRANE: We could not hold up our trains for an hour; in the case of any employees not operating trains there would be no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD: I save that by the proposal here. The law now applies to the company railways and I propose to apply it to the Intercolonial or Government Railway system with the saving clause that it shall not apply to those the performance of whose duties is necessary to the operation of the regular trains.

Mr. FOWLER: Have you a similar clause with reference to the other railways?

Mr. DOHERTY: As our section reads without any exception at all, applying to every employer and employee, I suppose it would so operate that the railways would have to stop their trains and let the men go out and vote and that certainly ought to be provided against.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Inasmuch as no special hour is fixed at which the company railways are to accord an hour to the employees for voting I do not think the amendment is necessary.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand the difficulty to be met is that a railway conductor who goes out on a train at 8 o'clock would be a great many miles away in a very short time.

Mr. J. D. REID: Has there been any difficulty in the past on account of Government railways in this respect?

Mr. MACDONALD: It is proposing an amendment which applies to all railways, and I understand that the minister accepts the proposition, as one that should apply to the Government railways as to the others.

Mr. DOHERTY: We might insert this addition:

This section shall apply to railway companies and to Government railways and their employees with the exception of employees engaged in the running of trains and to whom such time could not be given without interfering with the running of the trains.

Mr. PARDEE: What would be the effect of that amendment?

Mr. DOHERTY: In the first place to make it applicable to Government railways and in the second place to make it clear that with regard to all railways they would not be under obligation to give an hour to men engaged in the running of trains, to whom they could not give an hour without stopping the trains.

Mr. MACDONALD: Could not the minister go a little further and say the running of regular trains?

Mr. FOWLER: The running of a special train might be of much more importance than the running of a regular train.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister's amendment apply to street railways? Because if all men on street railways were entitled to a couple of hours it might disorganize transportation in cities.

Mr. DOHERTY: Does the hon. gentleman think it would? As they would not all have to be given their hour off at the same time it would surely be possible to arrange the schedule so as not to interfere with the working of the system.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Two hours seems a very unnecessary time to give an employee on a street railway to cast his vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: I presume that street railway employees, like others, have a dinner hour. We are not making them give two hours. I assume that these employees already have an hour for their dinner. Personally, I am not in a position to say how it will affect the running of a street railway system in a large city.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do I understand that the minister moves that amendment?

Mr. DOHERTY: To be absolutely frank, I am not perfectly satisfied with it, because when one comes to look at it, we have other systems of transportation besides railways. During the period of summer navigation there may be many voters employed on steamboats.

Mr. MACDONALD: You could not make it apply to vessels unless they were in port.

Mr. FOWLER: Has there been any request for this legislation? I have not heard of a case where an employer refused to let an employee go out and vote, whether he was on the opposite side of politics or not. It seems to me we are passing legislation that has not been asked for, and that there is no public demand or necessity for. It is imposing an obligation which is not at all necessary.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am sorry the hon. gentleman was not in the House when we were considering it. A section has been passed as part of the Dominion Elections Act that employers shall on polling day give to the voters in their employ at least one additional hour beyond the noon hour for voting purposes. That was passed some time ago, and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was simply moving an amendment that it should apply to employees on the Intercolonial who would be exempt from the provision of that section unless it were specifically stated otherwise by Parliament.

Mr. DOHERTY: So far as the demand for it is concerned, we have had very numerous and clearly representative delegations from workmen's organizations asking that we should give a whole day or a half-day's holiday in order that the men might vote. Since I have had the honour of being in the House I know that the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) has on several occasions proposed a measure to that end, and I think a great many of us have received very strong representations on the subject from representatives of organized workmen in the big cities. So whether the demand ought to be met or not, I do not think it can be said that this legislation was not asked for.

Mr. FOWLER: It is imposing a fine on an employer of labour. If a man employs 200 men and lets them off for an hour, he will lose 200 hours' work. If he had 500 men, he would lose 500 hours' work. This will make election day an expense to every employer of labour in Canada, and it does not seem to me to be right.

Mr. ARTHURS: Before this Bill is finally disposed of I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to some very desirable amendments to chapter 26 of the Revised Statutes of 1908. This chapter provides for the preparation of voters' lists in those portions of Ontario that are not under municipal organization. At the time it was passed it was no doubt very carefully thought out, but in practice it does not work out as well as it should. For instance, these lists have always been revised after the proclamation for an election, or within the last thirty or forty days before polling day. During that time the judges have to select the polling subdivisions, and the voter must necessarily be an actual resident within the polling subdivision for which the revision is being made. In other words, a man who has been residing in an unorganized township takes a few steps across the road into an organized township, and he is absolutely debarred from voting. Simply because he was not an actual resident of the unorganized territory he is not allowed to vote in the organized territory. Since the passing of this Act two thousand voters in my district have been deprived of the privilege of voting. The Act is also very cumbersome. For instance, why should it be necessary to have in an

unorganized district a board of three judges to consider appeals that might be made against the voters' lists, when in a large township with five or ten times the population the work is done by one county judge. Surely if one county judge is able to do this work in the larger cities he ought to be able to do it in districts where the population is sparse. I am calling these matters to the attention of the minister because they are somewhat important to me. I have forty polls of this nature with probably a voting population of 5,000. I think this state of affairs should be remedied. If it cannot be done on this particular occasion perhaps before the Bill is finally passed some way can be thought out for giving these men the right to vote. Let me point out further that the Ontario law makes matters a lot worse, because the province has separate voters' lists. These lists are posted up in the post office, and a man may see his name on them and not pay sufficient attention to see that it is only a provincial list, not a Dominion list. Then when the Dominion list is printed by the King's Printer he finds he is not in for that section at all.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no doubt there is a great deal in what the hon. member says, and no doubt the question is important. But I am afraid that for us to enter upon an examination of the law with regard to the making of lists with a view to remedying it, would be rather difficult at this stage of the session. However, I do not expect the Bill to have its third reading this evening and before it comes to third reading I will look into what has been said, and see if it is possible for us to deal with the situation.

I beg to move that section 5 be amended by adding thereto the following words:

This section shall apply to railway companies and to the Government railways and their employees with the exception of employees engaged in the running of trains and to whom such time cannot be given without interfering with the running of the trains.

Mr. MACDONALD: What penalty is provided for failure to comply with this section?

Mr. DOHERTY: This particular section does not provide a penalty for failure to comply with it. It was thought that it might be left to the application of the general provision which does provide a penalty for the violation of a statute where no specific penalty is prescribed.

Mr. MURPHY: Section 269 might apply.

[Mr. Arthurs.]

Mr. MACDONALD: In regard to the Government railway proposition, we would not want to take proceedings against my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), because that would be a very drastic procedure and probably he would not know anything about the violation of the Act. If there was some local official who transgressed the law there should be some way by which he could be reached.

Mr. KYTE: I nominate Mr. Gutelius.

Mr. ROGERS: I think you had better leave the Act alone unless you know what you are doing.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think that section 269 would apply, but I am quite satisfied that there is a penalty for the violation of any statutory disposition where no specific penalty is prescribed.

Mr. MACDONALD: In the Election Act?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, in the Criminal Code. I have sent for the statutes to find the clause.

Mr. MACDONALD: Perhaps we might let that section stand until the minister looks into it and comes to a conclusion in regard to it.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 7—form of nomination paper amended to require address for service of papers:

Mr. DOHERTY: The only change in the nomination paper is that in the new form the candidate is required to insert his address. That is in view of the provision in the Bill to amend the Controverted Elections Act that service in any contestation shall be validly made if addressed to the candidate at the address mentioned in his nomination paper.

Mr. MACDONALD: That would mean simply his post office address?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, we are suggesting to the House to provide in that Act that mailing to the address would be sufficient service.

Progress reported.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty, Bill No. 109, to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, was read the second time,

and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1—names of courts:

Mr. DOHERTY: The purpose of the repealing clauses i and viii of paragraph J of section 2 of the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, chapter 7, Revised Statutes, 1906, is to make the names of the courts mentioned in the Act correspond with their present names. In Ontario the name of the court has been changed and likewise in Saskatchewan and Alberta they now have the Supreme Court of the province. In the Act as it stands the court is referred to in this way:

In the province of Saskatchewan or Alberta, the Supreme Court of the Northwest territories pending the abolition of that court by the legislature of the province, and thereafter such Superior Court of justice as, in respect of the civil jurisdiction of the said court, is established for the province in lieu thereof.

The court now established is the Supreme Court of the province.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What are subsections 3 and 4 of section 2 which are repealed?

Mr. DOHERTY: Subsection 3 of section 2 of the present Act is as follows:

In respect of proceedings relating to or affecting an election for an electoral district partly in the province of Saskatchewan and partly in the province of Alberta, the court shall be the Supreme Court of the Northwest territories pending the abolition of that court by the legislature of the province of Alberta, and thereafter such Superior Court as, in respect of the civil jurisdiction of that court, is established for that province in lieu thereof.

I understand that there is no constituency now that is partly in each province and there is therefore no need for that provision. Furthermore there is no longor any Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories. Subsection 4 was a provision to cover a transient condition. It was as follows:

Proceedings under this Act which are pending in the Supreme Court of the Northwest territories in the province of Saskatchewan or the province of Alberta at the time of the abolition of the said court in the province may be continued in such Superior Court of justice, as, in respect of the civil jurisdiction of the said court, is established for the province in lieu thereof in all respects as if such proceedings had been instituted in such latter court.

The section ceases to have any operation.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—proof of right to be a petitioner:

Mr. PUGSLEY: This section is very drastic.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is intended to be drastic. In the view of the committee, it was not of material importance who presented the petition. The provisions of the Act with regard to security and so forth were looked upon as a sufficient protection to the party whose election might be attacked. Experience has shown that discussions with regard to the exact proof of the identity of the person who is the petitioner, and that he is a person whose name is upon the list, have been such a productive field for preliminary objections and discussions of no material bearing upon the substantial question as to whether the respondent was illegally or corruptedly elected, that it appeared to us that we would be justified in making the proof sufficient that the petitioner's name appears upon the list that is produced. This will apply to the great majority of cases, because in the bulk of cases there are lists. Where there are no lists, or where the petitioner is petitioning in his quality as candidate and his name might not be on the list, it is thought that an affidavit should be sufficient. There is ample protection in the affidavit, in the great facility with which it would lie within the power of the party whose election was attacked, to ascertain and prosecute for perjury, if any one who was not a candidate, swore that he was a candidate.

Mr. FOWLER: A man, who was a minor and who might not be entitled to vote at an election at all, might be a petitioner; simply because his name appears on the voters' list by fraud or inadvertence. You cannot go beyond the list and have the petition presented by a person who has a right to present a petition.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is the difference?

Mr. FOWLER: Why not use any one's name? Why say that the petitioner shall be a voter?

Mr. MACLEAN: That is quite true, but you must have designated by the statute some class from which the petitioner can be drawn.

Mr. FOWLER: If you permit any class to come in, then why make any condition at all?

Mr. MACLEAN: The electoral lists practically include every one who is 21 years of age and a British subject within

an electoral division. That is pretty wide, and any one who is on that list can be a petitioner.

Mr. FOWLER: He might not be a qualified person, and yet be on the list.

Mr. MACLEAN: As the law stood before, it was open to the respondent to come into court and say that the petitioner, while his name was on the list, was disqualified as a petitioner. It was very anomalous.

Mr. FOWLER: Why?

Mr. MACLEAN: Because the point really at issue should not be affected one way or the other by who the petitioner is.

Mr. FOWLER: Then why have a petitioner at all?

Mr. MACLEAN: If the hon. gentleman can provide some machinery by which he can try out a petition without a petitioner, all very well.

Mr. FOWLER: Who has a right in the ordinary course? There is something due to the candidate as well as to the petitioner. Why should the candidate be harassed by a man of straw? Why should not the petitioner be responsible for costs?

Mr. MACLEAN: He gives security of $1,000.

Mr. FOWLER: And the costs may go to $10,000.

Mr. MACLEAN: When the hon. member sees the remaining provisions of the Bill, he will see that the trials of election petitions are very much expedited, and that there will be less costs because there will be fewer appeals.

Mr. FOWLER: If the remaining provisions are as bad as this, they must be very bad.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—repealing sections 6 and 7:

Mr. FOWLER: Is section 2 passed?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. FOWLER: I wish to register my objection.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a provision in the Dominion Elections Act by which a man whose name may be on the list becomes disqualified by his own act. Perhaps that provision in the law is repealed somewhere here, but there is a section of the law as it stands to-day which says that any man who hires a team to take an elector to the poll is ipso facto disqualified. That man can not file a petition. There is a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada to that effect. Unless that section is repealed, it will be in conflict with this proposed legislation.

Mr. PROULX: This dispenses with the need of an affidavit on the part of the petitioner?

Mr. FOWLER: It dispenses with everything.

Mr. PROULX: The affidavit should remain. If a petitioner alleges charges against a member of this House, he should substantiate them by affidavit.

Mr. FOWLER: The petitioner under this proposed legislation might be a minor; he might be an alien enemy; he might not have a vote at all, his name might be on the list by fraud and misrepresentation; yet he could be a petitioner. He might be even in that delectable institution known as the Kingston penitentiary.

Mr. DOHERTY: He would not have an opportunity to file a petition.

Mr. FOWLER: You might let him sign.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not wish to oppose any strenuous objection against the work of this committee being approved, but I am inclined to think that unless some serious objection can be pointed out to the present statute it would be better to leave it alone. Practitioners have become familiar with the present statute, and they get along pretty well with it. If we change the law, it will take twenty years to have the courts interpret it and find out what it means. There will be more trouble, more litigation and more delay than will take place if we continue to act under the present law. I would leave the Act just as it is. It seems anomalous to declare that the petition shall be presented by a voter and then provide that even if his affidavit is absolutely false, it shall be conclusive evidence that he is a voter.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no doubt about the fact mentioned by the hon. member that the courts have a jurisprudence on the law as it now stands, and that the practitioners have become familiar with it; but what we have become familiar with is the fact that under the law as it now stands, and its practical application under that jurisprudence, and the way in which cases may be conducted, a party petitioned against may

sit through the Parliament to which he was not legally elected.

The purpose of this Bill is to remedy in this instance what seems to us a serious evil. As the law operates it practically comes to this: that a party who is protested sits through the greater part of a Parliament without any determination being reached as to whether he is lawfully elected or not. Looking at this section alone, it may appear that the Bill takes up a hostile attitude, if I may use that expression, to the party whose election is attacked, but I think that before we get through the Bill it will be seen that there are provisions that operate also to protect the party rightfully fighting a contestation.

Mr. FOWLER: Why not let this clause stand?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no objection, if hon. gentlemen wish time to consider the provisions of the Bill, to let the whole Bill stand. I may point out that the committee gave a good deal of time to this measure and it seemed to us that it was a desirable measure. Of course, if the House thinks it is not a matter of sufficient importance to call for the attention at this stage of the session, or if the House thinks that it is so important that further time is necessary, I have no objection to allow it to stand.

Mr. FOWLER: I would suggest that the committee go through the Bill now, allowing controversial sections to stand. Surely there are some sections that would meet with the general approval and in going through the Bill we will get a better understanding of the whole measure. To meet my view the Bill would have to be considerably modified. I do not think we should encourage petitions, because usually the sitting member obtains his election in the proper manner.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. FOWLER: I am surprised at the ribald laughter of some hon. members. They evidently think otherwise.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The matter of improving the Controverted Elections Act has been under discussion in this House for a great number of years, and I am surprised to hear the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Pugsley) say that nothing should be done. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has given the subject consideration or not, but unless he has I think he should not make a suggestion that the Bill should not be considered. It is not a very lengthy measure, and will not take very much time to consider. As the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) has pointed out, the fact is the Controverted Elections Act is a nullity, and

11 p.m. every member of Parliament should consider himself bound

in duty to make that Act a living force. I do not like to hear any hon. member suggest that we should abandon the whole Bill. I would rather entertain the suggestion that we should repeal the whole Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. FOWLER: Is it not attempted by this Bill to make the Controverted Elections Act a living farce instead of a living force?

Mr. MACLEAN: I fancy the hon. gentleman has not read the Bill and cannot tell—

Mr. FOWLER: I have read one section, and that is sufficient.

Mr. MACLEAN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman's reading and understanding of the Bill is not quite complete; perhaps the measure would stand a little further consideration on his part. I do not think there is anything unfair in section 2. The whole purpose of the Bill is to expedite the trial of election petitions. It eliminates preliminary objections and it provides a simpler method for the service of petitions and any process under the Act, and I think that is, in the main, a just provision.

Mr. STEVENS: How does this clause carry out, or assist to carry out, the proposal the hon. gentleman has spoken of?

Mr. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman knows, I suppose, that a great difficulty of petitioners under the Controverted Elections Act is in effecting service. Respondents leave the country, and when service has been attempted to be made in foreign countries the courts have held it back. Why should not service of the petition be made—

Mr. FOWLER: That has nothing to do with section 2.

The CHAIRMAN: We are on section 3.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not know that I can say anything further than has been said by the Minister of Justice. Anybody whose name is on an election petition is presumed to be a voter having the right to petition against the person elected. I think that should be prima facie evidence of his ability to petition.

Mr. STEVENS: Does not that make it possible for irresponsible parties through a solicitor to file petitions merely to cause annoyance to a person elected?

Mr. MACLEAN: No more so than to-day—there is no more opportunity for irresponsible persons to be petitioners than to-day.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I was on the committee that considered this Bill. I was not on it originally, but took the place of the former member from Prince Albert, Judge Mackay. I am free to say that these other gentlemen would not say, that the chairman of the committee, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) gave this matter much more attention than is usually given by committees to the matters referred to them. The sole desire of the committee was to find an expeditious and efficient method whereby elections that had been fraudulently contested should be set aside and those responsible for the wrong-doing in those elections quickly brought to justice. It may be that the legislation is disputatious in the broad sense of the term, but in a still broader sense it is legislation that, if placed upon the statute book, will help to improve public life and possibly do away with some of the stories we read from time to time in the press—not confined to one party but the common heritage of both—with relation to elections. If we can legislate to improve the conditions of public life, to make it possible for elections to be run without having recourse to money and to corrupt practices which are too often had recourse to in Canada, it would be a good thing. Of course, this cannot be done in a day. Walpole, in his time, declared that every man had his price. It took a long time to bring about the conditions that exist in England to-day. I think too much can not be said for the work given to this measure by the chairman of this committee and the junior member for Halifax—to single these gentlemen out among those who were deserving. I think this should be treated as a serious matter by this House. If we can do something to make it a little harder to get away with corruption and corrupt influences and the destroying of the body politic, I think we shall have done a good thing.

Mr. CARVELL: It was thought by every member of the committee that the law in respect of election protests as it now stands is practically a nullity; the only purpose which it serves is that of a club, to be wielded by a political opponent in order to protect himself or to arrange a saw-off. I take it that the hon. member for Kings and Albert does not take kindly to the provisions of this Bill. If the hon. gentleman accepts the principle that a simpler and more concise method of getting after corruption in elections is necessary, then this Bill will commend itself to his judgment. If, on the other hand, he takes the ground that the law is all right as it is, the provisions of the Bill will not appeal to him. It is provided, in the first place, that any person may file a petition so long as he puts up $1,000. The real fact of the matter is that the $1,000, not the personal standing of the petitioner, is the protection to the respondent. The meanest subject of the realm has the right to lay information in the courts of the country if he thinks a crime has been committed. If it is the honest intention of Parliament to provide machinery by which corruption at elections may be put down—my hon. friend and myself could, perhaps, give a good deal of information on this subject.

Mr. FOWLER: Speak for yourself.

Mr. CARVELL: I speak for my hon. friend as well. If any person has the right to lay an information in a court of law, then any person has the right to sign an election petition, provided his name is on the voters' list and he complies with the requirements of the law. I would have gone further and reduced the deposit to $500, but it was thought best to leave it as it is. We all know, too, that one of the great bones of contention in the past has been the matter of the service of election petitions. Let me give the hon. member for Kings and Albert an illustration, one with which he is probably familiar. The law of New Brunswick provides that the service of the writ must be made in a certain way; that it must be published in a newspaper, served on the respondent and posted in the registry office. The officer to whom the paper was given posted it on a bill-board in the lobby of the court house; the registry office was in the court house. I was counsel for the respondent in that case, and I contended that the publication had not been carried out according to law. I took the ground that posting the notice on a bill-board in the lobby of the court house was not posting it in the registry office. It may surprise my hon. friend to know that the Supreme Court of New Brunswick held that I was right.

Mr. FOWLER: It does not surprise me at all.

Mr. CARVELL: This kind of thing has a tendency not to facilitate the trial of election petitions, but to put all kinds of technical objections in the way. The question resolves itself into a consideration of whether we shall have election petitions, or whether we shall not have them. If we are to have them, then it is well to provide simply that a copy of the petition shall be mailed to the address given in the nomination paper.

Mr. FOWLER: I am not finding fault with that, I am in favour of that.

Mr. CARVELL: I am glad we have converted my hon. friend to that extent.

Mr. FOWLER: The hon. member for Carleton evidently thinks that he is the only person who desires fairness and purity in elections. I am just as anxious as he is that a man should be properly elected, and that if he is not properly elected he should be punished by the loss of his seat. But I want the Act to be a proper one. I believe in fair-play and protection, both for the man who is elected and for the man who is defeated. One would almost think, from the remarks of the hon. gentleman, that a man has committed a crime because he is elected; that because he happens to be elected, it is his duty to be unseated. I do not look at it that way at all. The man who is elected has a right to the protection of the law; yet everything is done to harass him. Even an alien, it is contended, should have the right to file a petition against him. Let the service be as simple as possible; send the paper, if you will, to his known place of residence. I care not how simple you make the service, but I do say that you should provide that the man who files the petition shall be a duly qualified voter. Why should he not be a duly qualified voter? What right has he to object if he is not?

Mr. BURNHAM: Did the hon. gentleman not say a few moments ago that he would have no objection to the ordinary process of issuing a writ?

Mr. FOWLER: Yes.

Mr. BURNHAM: What about the alien who puts up security?

Mr. FOWLER: The point is that he does not put up sufficient security. If he should put up a bond for the costs, then it would be all right; I would not care who filed the petition. I am sure that every member of this committee is just as desirous as the hon. member for Carleton is that elections shall be properly conducted. The hon. gentleman has said that he knows a great deal about corruption; perhaps in his zeal to be elected he did transgress, but I do not propose that he shall plead guilty for me to that charge. I am always very careful to avoid even the appearance of evil, so anxious am I not to do anything wrong in connection with elections. I do not see why it should not be required that the person who files a petition shall be a legally qualified voter. All he has to do is to prove that he is on the voters' list; that he has the necessary qualifications, that he is a British subject—surely he can prove these things easily enough. Where is there a chance for any preliminary objection in connection with that, if he is really a duly qualified voter, if he has the qualifications and is a British subject?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There have been very serious contests as to the qualification of the petitioner.

Mr. FOWLER: Because the conditions have not been fulfilled. My hon. friend speaks of the case in Carleton county. I do not know why he drags that case in because it has nothing to do with the matter under discussion. The Supreme Court of New Brunswick was absolutely right, in my opinion, in holding that the lobby of the court house was not within the registry office. I do not see how they could have held anything else; I think that is good law. Therefore it has nothing to do with this matter. By changing the Act as is proposed you are not going to avoid questions of that kind occurring; if you do not follow the conditions here, your petition will be set aside. There are certain conditions to be observed and if you do not observe them your petition will be set aside as in the other case. Perhaps you are making the conditions less onerous, but why can you not make this law simple in its action and yet require that a man filing a petition shall have some status in the community, that he shall be a legally qualified voter. That is all I ask.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is hard to determine at times.

Mr. FOWLER: I do not think it is hard to determine. It depends simply on his being a British subject, on his having the residence, being of the proper age and being on the voters' list.

Mr. MACLEAN: That would not prove him a legally qualified voter.

Mr. MARCIL: Suppose he is disqualified.

Mr. FOWLER: But the burden of proof is on the other side to show that he is disqualified. If he has these qualifications he is a qualified voter legally, prima facie.

Mr. CARVELL: Does not my hon. friend see he is getting back to the very condition of affairs that we are trying to eliminate, to the preliminary objections. I know enough about elections to be aware that one of the principal causes of objection is the question of the qualification of the petitioner. In very many election trials the petitioner has been brought up and examined from time to time prior to the trial and the question arises has he been disqualified by bribery, has he committed a corrupt act? If so he would not be qualified. Many petitions have been knocked out on that very matter; you raise a preliminary objection and get into the Supreme Court of Canada and lose a year or two of time. I ask the hon. member if he is not arguing for the continuing of the system of preliminary objections.

Mr. FOWLER: Does my hon. friend think that a man who has violated the election law and disqualified himself is the person to go into court? He should be like the complainant in any other case, the man who goes into court should have clean hands. But he goes in a disqualified person. I do not think that a man who is disqualified should be permitted to file a petition, and the onus of proof of the disqualification is on the respondent because if the petitioner shows he has fulfilled the conditions, that is all he has to show, and it is up to the other side to prove that he is disqualified.

Mr. MACLEAN: But he is petitioning not on account of himself alone, but of a large element of the public.

Mr. FOWLER: But the man who petitions on behalf of a large element of the public must have a right to do so and that right lies in his being a qualified voter; he represents the qualified electors. They are the only ones who can say who should be elected. Does he not belong to that class? There are very few constituencies with less than 4,000 or 5,000 qualified voters, and surely within the half or one-third of that number who support the minority candidate there must be enough duly qualified electors to file the petition. If there are not the petition had better go unfiled. It seems to me that from every standpoint we should require that the man should be a qualified voter. Simplify procedure as much as you like, but let the individuals who are parties to the trial—because, after all, the petitioner is the party, although he represents a considerable portion of the electorate—let these be the proper persons and then simplify your procedure as much as you like, and I am with you, but I am not with you to permit any sort of strawman to be put up for the purpose of annoying and putting to trouble a person who has received, according to the electoral returns, the majority of the votes in any constituency.

Mr. CARVELL: I understand that my hon. friend's principal objection is on the question of the petitioner. When he interrupted some time ago, as he had a right to do, I was pointing out the general purport of the Bill, and I had got over two points. The third principle which we tried to work out in this Bill was that the trial should be brought on almost at once. We all know that under the present law an election trial cannot take place until after all preliminary objections are decided, which sometimes takes two or three years, and it cannot be tried while Parliament is in session. We have tried to eliminate that and bring the practice very nearly to the ordinary practice in a civil suit in court. The petition takes the place of the statement of claim; provision is made that an answer shall be filed, and if it is not filed within fifteen days the clerk of the court files the answer and the petition is immediately at issue and the trial takes place regardless of whether Parliament be in session or not. That practically would be all the principles involved in the Bill that are different from the present law. We have left all the rest of the law as it is, we have left in the provision for preliminary examination of witnesses. We have provided also that a witness can be gathered in very early in the game, in fact you can apply to a judge almost at the time the petition is filed and have an order given that a certain person be examined. That prevents the witnesses getting out of the country.

These are the four cardinal principles involved in the Bill. I am very much in favour of the Bill, although I do not take credit for having originated the idea; I think it came from the Minister of Jus-

tice himself. The minister certainly has done all he could in order to make the Bill perfect. I want to say to the credit of the hon. gentleman (who occupies that position (Mr. Doherty) that I have never in my life seen in a deliberative body a gentleman who has more earnestly tried to work out a perfect scheme which would attain the object in view than has the Minister of Justice in working out this scheme. There has not been a move, there has not been a proposition put forward that appealed to his judicial mind as calculated to work out successfully and prevent bribery and corruption, but the Minister of Justice has adopted it. When it appeared to him, from his long experience as otherwise he was not at all afraid to say so. I do not think there has ever been a committee in the House of Commons that has been as thoroughly in harmony over the principles involved in any measure as this Election Committee in reference to this Bill.

To go back to the one point that my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Fowler) has taken objection to; I am not wedded to the form of this section. If my hon. friend wants to make any other provisions than that a man must be 21 years of age and a British subject, I have no objection so long as it does not involve the question of preliminary objections.

Mr. FOWLER: He may be the biggest blackleg in the world.

Mr. CARVELL: That may be true, but if he is a British subject and 21 years of age he is entitled to vote.

Mr. PROULX: Suppose there were preliminary objections, but no appeal.

Mr. CARVELL: The preliminary objections would take up months and months of time if there were no appeals. The moment you bring in the principle of preliminary objections you are defeating the object of this Bill. I do not care what amendments you have so long as they do not adopt the principle of preliminary objections.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I suggest that as it is nearly 12 o'clock it is pretty far advanced to take up the discussion of such an important measure as this. We had better sleep over it, and then when we come again to study the Bill we shall perhaps be in a better frame of mind.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am quite willing to agree to the suggestion of my right hon. friend. I think we have gained a great deal by this expression of opinion from both sides of the House. But before moving that the committee rise I should like to point out one thing, and that is this. It is required that the man shall be upon the list. Now the fact that he is upon the list shows that the question of his qualification has been tried out once and determined by whatever machinery is provided in the different provinces for ascertatining whether a man ought to be on the list or not.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: In my province we have no voters' lists.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is provided for.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: All that is required is an affidavit. A man who was irresponsible could put up $1,000 and the cost of the trial might amount to $5,000 or $6,000.

Mr. FOWLER: Perhaps the minister does not understand how the voters' lists are made up in some of the provinces. In the province of New Brunswick there is no contest whatever in many cases. Names are put down on the list of men who may be disqualified by reason of non-residence, non-age, or something else. Of course there are contests in some districts of New Brunswick, but the practice varies in different provinces. But because a man's name is on the voters' list, it does not necessarily follow that the matter has been tried by some tribunal. His name may have been placed on the list simply because he happens to be on the assessment list, and without any trial whatever. It seems to me that the consideration that should apply is that, before a man can challenge the election of any man who has been chosen as the representative of qualified voters, he should himself be of that class. It seems to me that is a reasonable proposition. I shall probably not be here when the Bill comes up again, but I appeal to the sense of this committee to insist that the man shall be a qualified voter.

Mr. DOHERTY: What I was proceeding to point out was that the fact that a man was on the list shows that at some time it had been decided by somebody, however imperfect the machinery—I do not wish to discuss that—that he was a qualified voter. Under the provisions of the Act he is on the list. That entitles him to vote. He may

be called upon to swear that he was not bribed and so forth, but as to his qualification to be a voter he is, as I understand the Act, on the list and qualified to vote.

Mr. FOWLER: Could he not be called upon to swear that he was a British subject and a qualified voter?

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. member will allow me, I did not intend to conclude by saying that he is entirely wrong, or by saying that what he says should not perhaps be acted upon. I was just pointing out that the fact that he is on the list shows this much, that by such machinery as the different provincial legislatures thought was sufficient—and we are proceeding on the basis that we are willing to accept that as our present system of regulating our franchise—that man has been found to be a qualified voter. Now what we propose to do is to take that a step further. It is suggested that many awfully evil things will follow from it. The hon. gentleman says that an irresponsible person may make a petition. That is absolutely true. But I wonder how many of us have ever come across an election petitioner who was a responsible person! I should be glad to meet any hon. member who has met such a one, because he had an exceptional experience, I think.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have known very many responsible petitioners in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. FOWLER: And so have I. Some of them are candidates.

Mr. DOHERTY: It has not been my experience. Those that I have had occasion to come in contact with were so highly irresponsible that they seemed to me to be invisible. I never was able to get in touch with them.

Mr. CARVELL: There are a few like that in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. DOHERTY: At all events it is perfectly possible to happen, and I do know that it does happen in some cases. So that after all the evil may not be so terribly serious. Technically, of course, it looks a very awful thing that a man who is not a voter may make a petition. It is said that blacklegs and scallawags may make a petition. Unfortunately blacklegs and scallawags may vote. Unfortunately there are such people on the voters' lists. I am quite prepared to give consideration to what has been said. I am always prepared to do that. If the hon. gentleman had said that we should have prima facie proof and not conclusive proof, always provided that by that we do not open the door to any preliminary trial on the subject of the man's qualifications, I should be perfectly willing to consider that. That is what we want to get at. It is not so very material whether you have conclusive proof or not, provided you do not interfere with this provision of the Bill that there shall be only one trial, and you will try everything at that trial. So long as we stand to that, I do not know that it is very material whether at that trial you allow the respondent, if he wants to, to start in to prove that that man who was on the list was not qualified. But we must have no two trials. There must be no issue to be separately tried, on the question whether or not the petitioner is qualified. That issue, if there is to be such must be tried simultaneously with the merits of the petition. There must be but one trial, that trial should go on as speedily possible. If we can secure that, for my part I shall be satisfied, and I fancy that my colleagues upon the committee will be satisfied too. I am quite prepared to consider whether making it prima facie proof would not do just as well as making it conclusive proof, as long as whatever the defendant wants to say on qualification is heard at the same time as anything else he wants to say in answer to it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Or that he may be twenty-one years of age and a British subject.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. Now, I am quite prepared to accept the suggestion of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Perhaps we will be better able to deal with this measure after we have slept over it, and therefore I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m., until Saturday, April 3, at 11 a.m.

Saturday, April 3, 1915.

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

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. PROULX: I beg to move that Public Bills and Orders be called, and that Order No. 34 be discharged.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What is my hon. friend's idea in making that motion?

Mr. PROULX: The substance of this Bill is an amendment to Bill No. 110, to amend the Dominion Elections Act. When I moved the amendment the other night the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) objected on the ground that there was a Bill on the Order Paper standing in my name embodying the principle of my amendment.

Motion agreed to.

SIR WILLIAM PRICE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: One of the Montreal papers states that on account of a difference between himself and the Government Sir William Price, the Chairman of the Quebec Board of Harbour Commissioners, has sent in his resignation. May I ask if this rumour is correct?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not aware that he has sent in his resignation, but he may have done so. There was an intimation some time ago that he did not propose to continue in that office. The statement that there is any difference between Sir William Price and the Government is absolutely without foundation.

HOUSE OF COMMONS REPRESENTATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

CORRECTION OF CLERICAL ERROR.

The House again in committee, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair, on Bill No. 106, to amend the Representation Act, 1914.—Sir Robert Borden.

Mr. DOHERTY: This Bill stood for the purpose of further consideration of provisions made with regard to certain changes in the description of constituencies in the province of Quebec. It was then suggested that instead of the form in which the Bill then was, in so far as it modified the description of the constituencies of Quebec East and Quebec West and Jacques Cartier, we should adopt as more desirable the form of repealing the sections and substituting other sections containing the proposed alterations. I have had this done, and I now beg to move that section 4 as it was in the Bill that was presented to the House be struck out, and the following be substituted therefor:

4. Number 6 (b), the description of the electoral district of Quebec East, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"(b) The electoral district of Quebec East which shall consist of the following wards of the city of Quebec to wit: St. John, Jacques Cartier, St. Roch and Limoilou, exclusive of the village of Stadacona."

The change made there is simply the exclusion of the village of Stadacona. Quebec West will now read as follows:

5. Number 6 (c), the description of the electoral district of Quebec West, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"(c) The electoral district of Quebec West which shall consist of the following wards of the city of Quebec to wit: St. Sauveur, St. Valier and St. Malo and the village of Stadacona and the municipality of Petite Rivière.

The amendment that is made there consists in the insertion of the village of Stadacona, and the words "the municipality of Petite Rivière." In the Bill sought to be amended it would have appeared that Petite Rivière was a ward instead of a municipality.

I beg also to move an amendment to section 5. The amendment to the existing Act sought to be made is the exclusion from the electoral district of Jacques Cartier of St. Denis ward, which, under the Act passed last year, forms a part of another constituency. The section that dealt with Jacques Cartier in the Bill as introduced was section 5, but it now becomes section 6, because we have taken in two sections to deal with the electoral district of Quebec East and Quebec West. Section 5 has now been struck out, and the following substituted as section 6:

Number 10 (a), the description of the electoral district of Jacques Cartier, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"(a) The electoral district of Jacques Cartier which shall be constituted as at present less the town of Verdun, Outremont, any part of St. Denis ward—

It is intended to exclude the whole of St. Denis ward.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If you say "any part," the question would arise "which part"?

Mr. DOHERTY: It would do no harm to exclude the whole of St. Denis ward. We would then say: "less the town of Verdun, Outremont, St. Denis ward." The only change is to exclude St. Denis ward.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The rest is as it is in the Act?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. What was wrong with the Act was that St. Denis ward was not excluded as it should have been. I beg to move that section 6 of the Bill as introduced be struck out, and that the following be substituted as section 7:

Number 14 (a), the description of the electoral district of Hull, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"(a) The electoral district of Hull shall consist of Hull city, East and West Hull, the municipality of South Hull, Gatineau Point, East and West Templeton, the town of Buckingham, the township of Buckingham, the township of Southeast Buckingham, the township of North Templeton, L'Ange Gardien, Portland East and West, Derry, Bowman, Villeneuve East and West, Blake, McGill, Bigelow, Wells, Wabassee and Dudley.

The effect of this is to add to the description of Hull, as it stands in the existing law, the townships of South East Buckingham, North Templeton and the municipality of South Hull. As the present Bill was introduced it only provided for the inclusion in Hull of Southeast Buckingham and North Templeton, in addition to those mentioned in the Act as it stood. I understand that it was considered that it properly should include the municipality of South Hull, and I am now moving to include in the description of the electoral district the municipalities of Southeast Buckingham, North Templeton and South Hull. That necesitates amendments in regard to the electoral districts of Labelle and Wright, because these portions which are included in Hull are, under the existing Act, included in Labelle and Wright. Southeast Buckingham is included in Labelle, and North Templeton and South Hull are included in Wright. Therefore, to make the descriptions of Labelle and Wright consistent with these changes, I beg to move that section 8 be as follows:

Number 14 (b), the description of the electoral district of Labelle, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"(b) The electoral district of Labelle which shall be constituted as at present less the town of Buckingham, the township of Buckingham, the township of Southeast Buckingham, L'Ange Gardien,—

etc. The amendment consists in excluding those townships and municipalities which have been put into the electoral district of Hull, and the rest of the description remains the same. Then, section 9 is as follows:

Number 14 (c), the description of the electoral district of Wright is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

[Mr. Doherty.]

Then follows the description of the electoral district of Wright as it stands at present in the statute, save that we add to the part excluded North Templeton and the municipality of South Hull. I think that completes the corrections in accordance with the agreement come to with respect to the matter.

In the description of the constituency of Jacques Cartier, the draftsman has put in the wording: "less any part of St. Denis ward." Inasmuch as only a part of St. Denis ward was ever included in Jacques Cartier, and we cannot, therefore, take out the whole, I suggest that perhaps the better way is to make the wording: "less any part of St. Denis ward at present included in said county."

Amendment agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is it the intention of my hon. friend to have a large atlas published showing the different constituencies? In 1903 a very large atlas was issued, and such an atlas is a great help at election time.

Mr. ROGERS: This matter has already received some consideration, and we will take it up again with a view of adopting the suggestion of my right hon. friend, which is a very good one.

Bill reported and amendments read the first and the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY.

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

Trade and Commerce—Trade commissioners and commercial agents, including expenses in connection with negotiation of treaties or in extension of commercial relations; miscellaneous advertising and printing, or other expenditure connected with the extension of Canadian trade, $150,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not suppose my hon. friend intends to spend very much this year in negotiating commercial treaties, but we shall be glad if he will give us some information as regards the different agencies that we have at the present time. If I am doing him an injustice in stating that I presume he does not intend to negotiate further commercial treaties this year, I shall be pleased to correct my statement.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): This vote is the same as that of last year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Have you any new agencies since last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: During the past year certain changes have taken place, and I will very briefly state what they are. In the first place, our trade commissioner in Germany, who had his head office at Hamburg, was caught and interned, and, although he had some degree of personal liberty, he was obliged to report at frequent stated intervals and was kept under very close surveillance. He did not succeed in getting out until February, when a transfer was made with a German consul in South Africa, and he arrived at Rotterdam. As throwing a little light on how close the cordon is drawn as regards news in Germany, I may say that, although he had considerable liberty and had conversations with a great many people, on his arrival at Rotterdam in February he received his first knowledge that a single Canadian had left Canada and had reached either Great Britain or the Continent. That throws some light on the extreme diligence with which the Germans keep information from getting to such a city as Hamburg. After a little rest, which he needed, he will proceed to Russia. I have made arrangements with Mr. Just under which he is to proceed to Russia by way of the north and spend a three or four months' mission in Russia. He speaks German well, and German is a good deal spoken in certain parts of Russia. He does not understand Russian, but with the aid of English and German, I think he will get through the preliminary work very well. Mr. Just is one of our best trade commissioners; has been well trained; is very diligent and active; understands thoroughly not only how to get information but also how to put it in an illustrative and attractive form. He will enter by Petrograd, and make a tour of Russia, visiting the chief centres and gathering all the information he possibly can. After visiting the western Russian cities, he will take in some of those on the Black sea. He will then proceed through the country to Siberia, coming out at Vladivostock, and thence come to Canada by way of the Pacific. Having got all the information he can in that time, I propose to have him spend two or three months in Canada visiting the different centres and having conferences with the boards of trade, business men and manufacturers, bringing to them the information he has gained in Russia, and in that way getting the interests of demand and supply close together. He will then be furnished with two assistants, who will be trade commissioners with him, permanently resident in Russia. Although Russia is much perturbed by the war, yet on account of its vast size and immense population, business goes on in great portions of that territory much as it is usually carried on. When the war is over, we think that Russia will afford a very large field for certain manufacturers and productions of Canada. Siberia itself is an immense country, much the analogue of our Northwest—quite as extensive, and producing much the same. Siberia has been rapidly filling up with immigrants from western Russia; about six hundred thousand a year are pouring into that portion of the country; and it is on the plans of the Russian Government to develop that country with railways as rapidly as it can possibly be done. So that, both from the east and from the west of Russia, there opens up, I think, a good prospect for our trade. Already some of our manufactures have found a large place in Russia. Agricultural implements to the amount of well on to two millions of dollars were exported to Russia during last year; and, although that trade is somewhat disturbed at the present time for financial and other reasons, that which has been accomplished shows what there is in the field. Then, a certain section of our manufacturing industries believe that there is a large future there for the marketing of railroad supplies of different kinds, particularly cars, and already some of our manufacturing interests have representatives in Petrograd and are pushing business with their usual diligence.

Mr. Lithgow is still at Rotterdam. I have kept him there because, although there is not a very great deal of commerce possible now between Holland and ourselves, yet that is a very important situation, and Mr. Lithgow gives us valuable information. He is being retained there for the present.

In China, where they have had a very good trade year, although at present and for some months past the country has been a good deal perturbed, I have appointed a trade commissioner, Dr. Ross, formerly of Belleville, or near there. Dr. Ross has been in China for eight or nine years, connected with business operations. He comes highly recommended. He has been at the work for six or seven months, and has proved very satisfactory so far as gathering and sending information is concerned, and bids fair to make one of our best commissioners.

In Japan, a trade commissioner was appointed, Mr. Johnson, who succeeded Mr. Harris, and he remained until four or five months ago, when, being an officer in the British army, he felt it his duty to go to the front, and he is now on leave of absence, and is either in Great Britain or at the front, I am not sure which. In the meantime his duties are being performed, and very efficiently performed, by the commercial attaché of the British embassy at Yokohoma, Mr. Crowe, with whom I had the pleasure of making acquaintance. He has been fifteen or sixteen years in that country, is a thoroughly good commercial man, and, what is more to the purpose, has a very large and sympathetic interest with Canada and its development. For the time being, under an arrangement made with the British Government, he is attending to our work in Japan, and is attending to it in every way satisfactorily.

Two of our young trade commissioners are being trained on the new plan which I explained to the House last year. They were first brought into the department, to be made thoroughly familiar with the methods and purposes of the department, and drilled in all our work, especially in relation to commerce, and also given some training in customs work, so that they might understand the forms and methods of our customs business. Then they are required to visit different places in Canada and gather information and make reports. The two young men to whom I refer have been with us now for eight or nine months. One of these, I have arranged, is to go with Mr. Just to Russia, to be one of the trade commissioners there under him. The other, in due time, will be transferred to some other position as it becomes vacant.

There has been no change in the trade commissionerships in Great Britain, except that our trade commissioner in Leeds resigned and came to Canada to live. Taking his place and doing his work since that time, has been his assistant, Mr. Dwyer, who is thoroughly well versed in the work of his office and has performed his duties fairly well. It is my intention, in time, to combine two or three of the cities in that district and have them under the charge of one of our trade commissioners, with a central office and with assistants in the other two centres. I think that in that way, with team work of three men, one at the head, we shall get better results than with independent commissioners, and shall carry on the work more economically as well.

I think it was stated last year that Mr. Harrison Watson had been appointed trade commissioner in London. He has performed that work satisfactorily. In Australia we have Mr. Ross, who was appointed by the late Government, and who is a thoroughly capable and reliable man—one of the best commissioners we have. In New Zealand Mr. Beddoe is still performing the work. Mr. Poussett is still in South America. Last year, having made a tour of all the states in South America the year before, he came to Canada, went over the country from Victoria to Halifax, and held communications with boards of trade, merchants, and others. He has since returned to his work in South America. Mr. Egan, who was transferred from Manchester, has charge of the work in South Africa, with two assistants. In addition to these services, there is an arrangement by which twenty or thirty British consular establishments are at the service of Canadian trade and correspond regularly with the department, giving information, reports and answers to any inquiries made by ourselves or by merchants or business men of Canada. The service in the British West India Islands is about the same as we had last year. Mr. Watson Griffin was appointed to make a thorough survey of the British West India Islands, Jamaica and Cuba. This he did; his report is now being published in sections in the weekly trade bulletin, and will subsequently be distributed in convenient form. I think that the business community will find his report very interesting and very useful.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The information which has just been given to the committee by my hon. friend is very satisfactory, particularly with regard to Russia and China. There is every reason to believe that soon after the war is over an enormous trade will spring up between Canada and Russia, and I look to the opening up at no distant date of a line of steamers between Prince Rupert and Vladivostock. What my hon. friend has said about Siberia is quite true; we can supply that part of the country with anything they want in the way of agricultural implements. The attention which my hon. friend is giving to the matter ought to bring good fruit in due time.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The lumber industry of the western part of Canada has

been in rather a bad way, and it has not been helped very much by the war, which has disorganized freights and financial conditions. I think the lumber situation in eastern Canada is locking up. Inquiries which are being received from France, Great Britain and Belgium, indicate a more satisfactory condition in respect of certain kinds of lumber produced by Canada. The condition of things in the West during the last year and a half or two years has contributed to a diminution of building activities, and naturally this has had a very material effect upon a large number of the British Columbia mills. Boards of trade and others have been in correspondence with me with reference to some special means by which they could be helped. Trade commissioners in all countries were instructed to make special investigations in regard to markets for British Columbia lumber, and a very extensive and useful series of reports was sent in. Although this information has been useful, British Columbia felt that its case ought to be specially considered, and after mature consideration I acceded to that suggestion as being reasonable, under the circumstances. Accordingly, I appointed a special commissioner, who will take up his duties in a day or two. He will go from British Columbia to Japan, spending a little time there, and will then proceed to make investigations in China and India. China is now a large consumer of lumber, and when she begins to open up and develop her vast resources, lumber will form a most important item of import. What strikes one as he goes through China is the extreme bareness of the whole country. In years gone by, when the principles of conservation were not applied, the timber was stripped from the country, and to-day almost every hill in China is bare to the top. In the northern and far western portions of the country they have, of course, a considerable amount of timber, but the greater part of that vast country, having done nothing in the way of afforestation or reforestration, must depend upon outside countries for its timber. From India, the commissioner will go to Australia and New Zealand; thence to South Africa or South America, I am not sure which; thence to Great Britain, where he will conclude his investigations. I asked the lumber and forests interests in British Columbia to recommend to me a proper man for this position, and they recommended a Mr. McMillan, recently connected with the Forestry Department in British Columbia, who was born and educated in Ontario, and who has had a good deal of experience in this line.

12 noon.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I wish to call the minister's attention just for a moment to the difficulties of the Maritime Provinces in regard to freight. It is very difficult at the present time to get steamers to carry lumber. The most convenient class of vessels that we now have in Canada is the larger class of schooners, which might very well be employed in the trade between eastern Canada and British Columbia. At the present time there is quite a demand on the coast of eastern Canada for British Columbia pine. In the town of New Glasgow where I live, large quantities of it are used in the manufacture of cars for our railways; in fact the specifications in some instances do not permit of any other kind of lumber being used for certain parts of the car. This lumber has to come by rail, and in many cases at a very great expense. What I wish to point out to the minister is that it could come for half the cost by water, provided that the vessels were permitted to carry it down the western coast of Canada and through the Panama Canal. But the great difficulty is that the coasting laws do not permit a captain holding a coasting license to go into those waters. The laws are now so restrictive that a captain with a coasting license cannot take a ship from an eastern port in Canada through the Panama Canal to British Columbia, or vice versa; and I suppose that nine-tenths of these large schooners that I have spoken of are manned by captains holding coasting, and not deep sea, licenses. If my hon. friend had enough influence with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to get him to remove this difficulty he could do a great deal towards promoting trade between British Columbia and eastern Canada and I think, the eastern ports of the United States as well. That would be a great relief to the shipping people of the Maritime Provinces, who are hampered in their trade not only with the western coast of America, but with South America as well. We are not able to send our vessels down to the River Plate or to Rio or to any of those ports where there is now a profitable business. There is no reason in the world why they should not go there. I think it would be impossible for anyone to furnish a good reason why a captain holding a coasting license should not be allowed to go anywhere

along that coast. Our captains traded there for a hundred years prior to these new restrictive laws being introduced, and they always succeeded in getting back and making profitable voyages. Our captains to-day are just as good men as they were, but owing to the legislation that has been passed here in regard to coasting voyages they are not able to take advantage of that trade.

There is another question to which I should like to draw the minister's attention while I am on my feet. Last autumn, after the war broke out, there was considerable discussion in the papers in regard to the prospects of trade in pit props between the ports of Nova Scotia and Great Britain. It was pointed out that owing to the disturbance in Europe the Baltic trade had been cut out, and that the mine owners in Great Britain required large quantities of pit props, and that these might be supplied from Nova Scotia or some other of our Maritime Provinces. A good many people in the Maritime Provinces were interested in that proposal. I am told that my hon. friend has been making some inquiries in regard to it, and I am sure that any information he could give to the House and the public as to the prospects of developing a trade in pit props between our ports and Great Britain would be very interesting.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The matter was taken up by the Department of Trade and Commerce, and a deal of correspondence ensued. It became a matter of very great moment to the mine owners in Great Britain, and they had some conversations with the British Government in regard to it. The result of it all was that a Commission was appointed, consisting of representatives of the mine owners and a representative of the British Board of Trade. They came to Canada, and we placed at their disposal all the information and facilities we had. They visited different parts of Canada, taking in Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. They also made a visit to Newfoundland. After they had gathered all their information they made a report which, in the main, followed along this line: the resources were ample in Newfoundland and in the portions of Canada that they visited. But some difficulties were apparent. One was the difficulty of freightage, which has been a difficulty in every line of enterprise. Another was that it was impossible for them to lay their hands upon any sufficient supply of pit props that were ready for the market. They had then to face this condition: that if contracts were entered into the pit props would have to be cut in Canada during the months of the winter that has just passed, and brought out for spring and summer transport. Difficulties in two ways cropped up there. No one knew how long the war would last or how soon the Baltic supply would again be accessible—and pit props come from other European countries besides Russia. The trouble then was with making contracts for an indefinite period of time. No one here would like to contract unless he could contract for a year or two years' supply, and the mine owners in Britain did not want to make a contract for one or two years' supply because of the uncertainties of the situation. Some business has taken place; and I think some work has been done during the past winter, but on a somewhat limited scale. The commission also made inquiries in British Columbia, and I believe some busines in pit props has resulted from that part of the country. The commission's report shows that the resources of Canada for the kind of timber have been examined into and found ample. I think that is the main information that I can give my hon. friend.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is the minister of the opinion that the trade could profitably be carried on in times of peace?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That will depend. It is thought that the price of pit props will never again be as low as in the past, and if the price is permanently raised it may make business on this side possible. I have also heard that some of the mine owners are substituting metal props for timber, but that is just an experiment, and whether it can be done economically or not I do not know.

Mr. MACDONALD: In my county a large number of men are engaged in the coal industry. The difficulty in making contracts was that the gentlemen who came to conduct the business in Nova Scotia insisted that the inspection of the pit props should take place on delivery in England. This wood is in itself not very valuable, and our men reasoned this way: suppose we send a ship load of pit props which, after a rigid inspection, are condemned; it would be impossible for us to sell that timber, as it is not used for other purposes, and the venture would be a total loss. From the way in which the business is carried on in connection with our mines, of necessity there must be quite a number of

these pit props rejected from time to time by the local people. The consequence is that men in the business fear to engage in any kind of wholesale way in the delivery of these goods to England. If the parties who are interested in obtaining that trade could arrange for an inspection of timber on this side, I am quite sure that there would be a very much larger supply offered. The business of cutting pit props is not confined simply to the winter season in our province but goes on during all seasons of the year. When there is a good deal of snow it is easy to bring this small wood out on sleds, and the opportunity is therefore taken advantage of, but at the same time the work is going on throughout the year. Having some clients who are engaged in this business, I happen to know that this is their principal difficulty with regard to engaging in this business. If the question of inspection was solved there would be a great deal more of this class of timber offered.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It would be quite possible to solve the question of inspection if other conditions could be made right. My own department would be quite willing to undertake to have the inspecting done on this side, and done under specifications as given on the other side, just as we have done in some other particulars. That could be facilitated if the other conditions could be made right.

Mr. MACDONALD: If there has been any slackness, that has been the cause of it. You can send deals, or any of the other qualities of lumber that have been going to England, and timber of that class that is found defective in some respects can be disposed of for other purposes, but that condition does not arise in regard to pit props.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: The discussion relating to the development of our trade with Russia and Siberia is very interesting to me. I agree with what my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) have said in regard to the possibility of that trade. For the information of the committee, I might say that about a year ago I travelled with a gentleman from Paris who told me that he, at that time, was arranging to get the capital to put on the North Pacific a line of steamships trading between Vladivostock particularly and our own British Columbia ports. I have no doubt in my mind that the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific will bring to Canada a very large portion of the trade from Korea, Manchuria and Siberia. It may be of interest to the committee to know that, even if this occurred, it would only be a recrudescence of a state of commerce which existed on that coast and between these countries over a hundred years ago. Long before there was a city on the Pacific coast, in California, in Oregon, in Washington, or in our own British Columbia, there was an emporium of Russian trade in the North Pacific at the ancient capital of Alaska known as Sitka. The city of Sitka was established in 1799, and during the early decades of the last century Sitka was the centre of the Russian trade which supplied the Russian trading posts on the coast and rivers of Alaska and on the Yukon River itself from Behring Sea up the river for a distance of between four hundred and five hundred miles. When the Hudson Bay traders crossed from Hudson bay to the headwaters of the rivers flowing into Behring sea and floated down the Porcupine river on their first trip of discovery, they found, on the lower reaches of the Yukon, the Russian traders there before them. With Alaska, which was then known as Russian America, and with the coast as far down as the place called Fort Ross, which was within 150 miles of the present city of San Francisco, the Russians traded and traded extensively. They bought furs and brought the people engaged in the fur business their supplies. After the transfer of Alaska, or, as it was then called, Russian America, to the United States, which occurred in the same year as our own Confederation, 1867, that trade became practically extinct, and since then there has been very little trade between Alaska, or the North Pacific ports and Russia. However, the trade is there and is capable of being developed in a very extensive way. As a result of the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, the founding of the new city of Prince Rupert, and the establishment of a line of boats from that city to Russian ports, particularly Vladivostock, we shall in a very short time be able to develop a very large and profitable trade.

There is another continent with which I have always felt we have not had as much commerce as we should have had. I refer to the South American continent, and I would like to ask the minister what means we are taking to develop and encourage an interchange of commodities between Canada and that Continent. It is known to the

House that to a very large degree the trade of South America is largely in the hands of European countries—England, Germany, Holland and France. The United States have not had that trade intercourse with the South American republics that perhaps they might be considered entitled to. It seems to me that the time is opportune for our Government to take cognizance of this fact, and to do everything possible to cultivate commercial relations between Canada and the South American republics, where I am sure there is a great deal of profitable trade to be secured.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Maybe my hon. friend who has just sat down is expecting a word at least in reference to the latter part of his question. I listened, as the committee did, with a great deal of interest to his remarks in reference to Russian trade. The historical reminiscence is a very valuable one, and I hope we shall be able to reproduce the olden trade in much larger proportions. In reference to South America, I stated that one of our Canadian trade commissioners, Mr. Poussett, was instructed, a year and a half ago, to make a complete tour of all the states of the South American continent. He has spent a little more than a year in making a tour of these countries and making a very thorough, and in some respects, minute examination into the conditions of these different states and the possibilities of trade between these states and Canada. His reports have been published widely and supplemented, as I said to the committee a little while ago, by personal visits to different parts of Canada. Mr. Poussett went through our country, spending about four months in visiting all the larger cities. So it remained, and the war intervened. The war, of course, caused dislocation and difficulties. There is more than simply supplying the demand for the articles to be exchanged in dealing with our trade, or any other country's trade, with South America. There are financial and banking arrangements which seem to be absolutely necessary. At the present time the United States, which has very large resources, which has been very enterprising in reference to South American trade and which has not yet reached a very large measure of success, is up against that difficulty. It is acknowledged now that what is necessary in order that there may be a remunerative trade and extension of trade between such countries as Canada and the United States and South America, is some form of banking and financial arrangement which will put credit and the interchange of money on a fair basis. A great many of these South American states have had to introduce moratoria. They were disappointed in not getting into the European markets, just about the time they were making loans for their own necessities, and they did not get these loans. The state of credit all through South America will take some time to rehabilitate. The Germans had a system of giving long credits to the merchants, running up to a year and even longer, and that disorganized the business of other countries, and in time led to a large decrease in their trade. But long credits have disadvantages as well as advantages, and in the end I think German trade would have gained no very great advantage. That, however, has been cut clean across at the present time, and now the other countries are going in with the idea of not imitating the Germans by giving long credits, and they are trying to arrange banking and financial facilities for trade. If we are going to do a trade with South America we shall want a direct steamship communication, and that we have not had up to the present. When things begin to settle down, I think this is one of the questions Canada will have to take up.

Trade and Commerce—bounties on lead and crude petroleum; to cover expenditure in connection with the administration of the Act, $7,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is the production of petroleum increasing or decreasing?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The bounty paid on lead in 1899, the first year the bounty was operative, was on 449,636,000 pounds, and in 1913, the bounty was paid on 23,985,569 pounds. The bounty, therefore, has largely decreased. The payment of bounty is contingent upon the prices of lead in the market, and the price of lead in late years has been higher so that the bounty paid has been less. On crude petroleum, in 1905, the first year of the bounty, the bounty was paid on 23,336,478 gallons, and in 1914 the bounty was paid on 7,824,219 gallons. The bounty on manilla fibre has lapsed. At present there is a prospect, I do not know how far it may go, of petroleum being found in quantities in the Northwest, and that, of course, would have an effect upon the amount of bounty that may have to be paid.

I found out something which I did not know myself before, and which probably the members of the House did not know, and it is rather an important thing. If you look at the statistics of the production of metals in Canada, you will find that lead, to a certain value, and nickel, to a certain value, are put down as the production of Canada. The fact is, taking nickel for example, if nickel is put down in our returns as having a value of so many millions of dollars, it is the value of the nickel, not as it leaves Canada, but after it has gone out and been refined, and when all the labour and interest on capital, etc., is added to it. It is well for us to have that in mind, and I think it would also be well in future statistics that this shall be thoroughly noted, so that people may not be led away with the idea that the nickel, lead, etc., that is credited to Canada, is really worth that when it leaves the country.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: How is this bounty fund administered, as to when and where the bounty is paid? I ask this question because at present we have some very promising silver-lead properties in the Yukon, and they are just beginning to ship the ore. I do not know what percentage of lead this ore contains, but I believe it is pretty high. For the information of the people in the Yukon interested in that industry, I would be glad if the minister would tell us how this bounty money is paid, whether at the mine or at the smelter or when the lead is smelted.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The object of the bounty was to encourage silver-lead smelting, and the smelting of other ores than silver and gold in Canada, so that it is not a bounty upon the ore but a bounty upon the products smelted in Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: Has anything been done by the Government towards prohibiting the export of nickel in its raw state or in the matte? Canada practically controls the nickel supply of the world, and there has been a great deal of agitation in the newspapers of late in regard to this question. It was brought up in the Ontario legislature, and I would like to know if this Government has been dealing in any way with the question.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend has been interested in nickel and in the controversy that has been going on, he probably knows as much as I do in regard to that question. We have one of the largest, if not the largest, sources of supply of nickel in the world, and we are the principal exporter of nickel ore and in the matte—mostly in the matte; but the refining of the ore, as well as the ultimate refining of the matte, has up to the present time been done in Great Britain or in the United States. On account of the uses to which nickel is put, the subject, since the war has broken out, has come to a prominence in another way rather than by the mere establishment of an industry in Canada. The Canadian Government, as I think the House has been informed, has been acting in close sympathy and co-operation with the British Government with reference to the ultimate destination of nickel, and an arrangement has been made between the two Governments, which is entirely to the satisfaction of the British Government, towards directing the ultimate destination of nickel refined from Canadian matte or ore. It is not advisable to say just what that arangement is.

Mr. TURRIFF: My information is that the amount of labour expended on nickel after it reaches the stage of matte, in refining it further to make it fit for commerce, is much greater than the amount of labour expended in mining, roasting and smelting, and that absolutely none of the further refining is done in Canada. The whole nickel industry of Canada, which is, I understand, about 85 per cent of the nickel industry of the world, nickel being found in only one other place, namely, New Caledonia, in the region of Australia, is in the hands of two companies—the Mond Company of England, and the Canada Copper Company of Sudbury, which refines all its products in the United States. I do not suggest that the minister should say anything definite at the present time, but serious consideration should be given to the question whether something cannot be accomplished by which the nickel can be refined in Canada or at least within the British Empire. If that were done, we would have a much better control over the industry. If nickel cannot be procured, proper armour-plate cannot be manufactured; so that the subject is worthy of consideration, both from the war point of view and from the economic point of view, of having many millions of dollars spent in Canada instead of in the United States and Great Britain, especially when we have the whole matter in our own hands.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What my hon. friend says is in many particulars along my own line of thought. I would think, how-

ever, without having made a study of the question, that when you come to the employment of labour, the major part of the labour expended on nickel is done in our country. When you come to the refining of the nickel, a large part of the expenses is on the equipment and machinery; but not being an expert on that matter, I am not certain. My hon. friend is on the same platform with me in this respect, that we are both in favour of made-in-Canada.

Mr. OLIVER: I have received several petitions asking that the export of nickel be restricted. Possibly the form of the petition emanated originally from the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). At any rate the petitions have been received. While possibly it is not formal, I would be very glad, if the minister would on behalf of the Government, give in a sentence what would be a fair answer to the petitioners.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not remember just what the wording of the petition is, but its object is that steps should be taken if possible, by which the nickel, which is found in Canada and the initial processes in regard to which are carried out in Canada, should be further refined in Canada itself, so that the finished article being in Canada might be absolutely under the control of Canada, which it is not now, when it is exported either to the United States or Great Britain. The Government, however, while it has a large interest in that question, has not yet come to any conclusion, either that nickel should be prohibited from going out in the form of matte to another country, or that the Government itself should undertake the operation or refining it. There are a good many factors to be thought of in the establishment of such an industry, and as to the capital and equipment necessary for it in Canada. I do not think I can give any more formal answer than that.

Trade and Commerce—salaries and contingencies under the Inspection and Sale Act, $3,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This vote has been reduced by $2,000. I have been economical in it; perhaps I have been too economical. Last year we had a vote of $5,000, and we did not expend within $2,000 of it for the inspection we put on and the expenses we incurred, and on the appeal of the Minister of Finance I reduced the vote. I am sorry I reduced it so much.

Trade and Commerce—salaries and contingencies under the Cullers Act, including an amount of $2,000 for superannuated cullers, $9,400.

[Sir G. E. Foster.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The committee will notice the reduction in this item. A reduction occurs each year, because as the old officers who are superannuated pass away, their superannuation allowances do not of course have to be provided for.

Mr. PROULX: Do the cullers contribute to a superannuation fund?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: An arrangement as to the cullers was made some years ago, by which those who were not considered necessary for the carrying on of the work, which is vastly diminished, as my hon. friend knows, and who had been a long while in the service, were put on the superannuation list. I am not quite sure, but I think a slight contribution to the superannuation fund was taken from their salaries.

Census and Statistics, $50,000.

Mr. OLIVER: There is a reduction here. What is the reason for it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As the tabulations are finished in the census which was taken in 1911, the help necessary to make these tabulations passes out.

Mr. OLIVER: Then you actually have one department of the Government that dispenses with services that are not needed any longer?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I try to do that, and some times, especially in times like these, it is pretty difficult to do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The hon. gentleman is not much like his colleagues.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When you have to let temporary employees go after they have been at work for two or three years, and in times like these when many of them have nothing to depend upon, it makes one think carefully and examine closely to see if there is not work to be done. We keep for this work those that are deserving and let the others go. That is what I try to do.

Canada Year Book, $10,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it not possible to bring the publication of the Year Book closer up-to-date? Any issues of the Year Book that I have ever seen have been so far behind that much of their interest and value has been lost. The Year Book is a most valuable compilation, but it loses much of that value by reason of its lateness.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I found that difficulty when I came into office, and I have no doubt hon. gentlemen opposite found it so in their time. The difficulty is not so

much in getting the Year Book ready in time, but, after it is ready, getting it printed on account of the congestion of printing at that season. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman speak of it as being a valuable work. I have not heard much of it from members of the House, but I hope all have got copies and have looked into it. I think the Year Book shows a great advance in its make-up and material, and we are trying to make a really good Year Book. This year, several new features were added, and I have had very strong commendation of the work from people in other countries as well as people in Canada.

Mr. MURPHY: Is the material compiled by officers of the hon. gentleman's department?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. It is only right to say, however, that last year I started a system of having a number of monographs upon certain important features of Canadian history, resources or geography, and for these I levy upon the best men I can get outside my own department. For instance, the article in the current Year Book was contributed by Dr. Doughty, who, of course, has done it very nicely.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the subject?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is on the history of Canada. The idea is to have the geography, the history, and other subjects in relation to the country put into monographs which, while not too long, will yet give the distinctive facts of the subjects treated. Then, the Year Book being a consecutive publication, next year's volume will refer to the articles in the preceding Year Books, and in the course of years we shall get into the publication, and I trust permanently on record, features in regard to Canada that will be of very great value.

Mr. MARCIL: How does the minister arrange about the translation of this book? Is the translation done before the book appears in English, or after?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not certain, but I think this work is translated in my own department. I have a French translator there, I know.

Mr. MARCIL: The hon. minister knows the value of having the work out as soon as possible?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, and I try to do that.

Dominion's Royal Commissions, $15,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is not likely that any of this will be spent this year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not so very sure. The Dominion's Royal Commission visited Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia last year and did its work there. It may finish the work in Canada this year. It is under advisement at present, and quite possible—and I think probable—that the Commission will take up their work in Vancouver some time late in summer or early autumn, and will finish the examination of Canada, and then the whole of their work will be finished so far as visiting and examining the countries is concerned.

Mr. MACLEAN: May I remind the hon. minister that he promised the other day to give me information with respect to the steamship service between St. John and Bear River, which was discontinued in 1912? I hope he will be able to tell me that the subsidy will be restored.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Seeing my hon. friend to-day, I was reminded that I was to furnish information on that and on another subject which he mentioned to me. I hope to have the information before the House closes.

Mr. MARCIL: As to the Gaspé service, has anything been done?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is in statu quo.

At one o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Salaries, rents, wages and contingencies under the Canada Grain Act, $625,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the minister explain the reduction?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The reduction is really a matter of bookkeeping; it is more apparent than real. Out of last year's vote we had to pay, during a certain part of the year, transport charges on the grain that came into the elevators. This year we do not wish to have a vote for that, as it is being paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and re-payments, when made will go into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The total expenditure last year under this head was $450,737.57, and the expenditure up to February 28, 1915, was $444,945. The expenditure of this year, therefore, will be larger than that of last year, due to the fact that while last year we had only one

elevator at work, the terminal at Port Arthur, this year we will have at work two at Saskatoon and Moosejaw, and, later in the season, one at Calgary, which means that three internal storage elevators have to be provided for this year. The vote includes general expenses of the staff. It takes in salaries of the staff administering the Canada Grain Act, which consists of permanent employees of different grades, and temporary employees who are required for a greater or less portion of the year; internal elevators, in addition to the terminal at Port Arthur; travelling expenses of commissioners; contingencies at the different centres where the officers are working; printing and stationery; general.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister intimated that the Calgary elevator will be in operation some time during the season.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Probably by the first of October.

Mr. OLIVER: What has been the cost respectively of the terminal elevator and the Saskatoon and Moosejaw elevators?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In round figures: the terminal elevator, $1,300,000; the Saskatoon and Moosejaw elevators, a little more than $1,000,000 each. The terminal elevator has a capacity of 3,250,000 bushels, the Calgary elevator, 2,500,000, and the others 3,500,000.

Mr. OLIVER: This vote will include the Calgary elevator?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: For the portion of the season during which it is operated, yes.

Mr. OLIVER: How much of this vote will be required for the operation of each of these elevators?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: One can scarcely tell as yet; we only know what has been paid out up to date. In the Saskatoon elevator we have a superintendent, a clerk, an electrician, a foreman, a weighman, a cleaner and four temporary labourers. The staff at the Moosejaw elevator is about the same.

Mr. OLIVER: What will be the total cost, approximately?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: So far as salaries are concerned, the superintendent gets $2,500. The salaries of the clerk, electrician, foreman, weighman and cleaner amount to about $475 a month, which, multiplied by twelve, will give approximately the amount paid out for permanent salaries. Then, whatever temporary help is necessary, and there is always more or less, will have to be added to that.

Mr. OLIVER: What amount of business was done respectively by the terminal, the Saskatoon and the Moosejaw elevators last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will just give the information generally. The gross earnings of the Dominion Government elevators amounted to $216,795; the direct expenses were $59,304, leaving a gross profit of $157,491; indirect expenses taken therefrom leave a net profit of $148,684. Then there were some little additions to income amounting to $846, making a net income of $149,530.

Mr. OLIVER: On what turnout of grain?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A trifle over ten million was handled in and out.

Mr. TURRIFF: After allowing interest on the investment, that shows a fairly good profit?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. The cost of the elevator was $1,300,000 in round figures. After a reasonable amount for interest and depreciation has been deducted from that, there is still a fair profit. That was our initial year, and we were charging the rates which prevailed with all the other elevators, and which prevailed up to the end of that year. It was a pretty favourable year in many respects, but we will not know just where we are until we have operated the elevator probably for at least three years. Then we shall be able to strike an average for the seasons. For instance, we shall not handle so much grain this year as last, because there was not so much grain raised, and consequently there is not so much to put through.

Mr. OLIVER: About what was the total amount of grain put through the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will first give the figures for the Government terminal elevator: wheat, 5,278,040 bushels; oats, 1,520,892 bushels; barley, 462,148 bushels; flax, 2,886,990 bushels; rejected grains, 109,813 bushels; making a total of 10,257,883 bushels. I do not appear to have the statement of the figures for the other elevators, although it should be here.

Mr. OLIVER: Would it be 100,000,000 bushels?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: More than that; somewhere around 150,000,000 or 160,000,000 bushels.

Mr. OLIVER: I just wish to get a general idea of the total output of the Government elevators as compared with the other elevators.

Mr. TURRIFF: How many terminal elevators are there?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The terminal elevators in the western inspection division have a capacity of 41,050,000 bushels of grain. There is the Canadian Pacific railway elevator at Transcona, the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator "D" at Fort William, and, also at Fort William, the Consolidated Elevator Company, Eastern Terminal Elevator Company, Empire Elevator Company, Fort William Elevator Company, Grand Trunk Pacific Elevator, the Grain Growers' Grain Company, the Ogilvie Flour Mills Company and the elevator of the Western Terminal Elevator Company. These have a capacity of 25,050,000 bushels. At Port Arthur there is the Government elevator, the Port Arthur Elevator Company, Limited, the David Horne elevator, a small elevator, and the Empire elevator, these having a capacity of 15,000,000 bushels, making a total of 41,050,000 bushels. Then there are hospital elevators in the western inspection division with a capacity of 2,130,000 bushels. In the eastern inspection division there are twenty-two elevators with a capacity of 29,850,000 bushels. As showing the number and capacity of country elevators and warehouses, together with the Ontario terminal hospital elevators and public elevators in the eastern division, there are 2,607 elevators, 24 warehouses, 1,207 stations, and the total capacity is 154,765,000.

Mr. McCRANEY: Would the minister make a statement as to the operations of and business done by the Saskatoon elevator?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I can only give my hon. friend a statement up to the time of the last monthly report. That gives a fairly comprehensive view of the operations at Moosejaw and Saskatoon. The Moosejaw elevator started in somewhat handicapped for want of proper power, but it started operations on the 14th October with one engine and about a quarter of the power necessary to run the elevator satisfactorily. On the 1st November the second unit was installed, and these two units, although there has been some little trouble, have been kept in constant operation. The total amount of grain received from the 14th October to the 14th February, 1914, which is as late as I have the statement for, is as follows:

	Bushels.
Wheat	1,642,705
Oats	442,998
Barley	12,525
Flax	580

Shipped out:

	Bushels.
Wheat	437,774
Oats	62,357

Leaving in store:

	Bushels.
Wheat	1,220,928
Oats	340,641

Together with all the barley and flax that was taken in.

Mr. TURRIFF: I suppose a large quantity of that would be wheat which is being held for seed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A large portion of that was wheat taken in for seed and purchased through the agency for that purpose. The following is a statement of the grain in store and held by the Government for seed purposes:

	Bushels.
Wheat	800,000
Oats	29,122
Barley	4,030

That compares with the following quantities held on commercial account:

	Bushels.
Wheat	852,705
Oats	373,876
Barley	9,485
Flax	188

Showing that the commercial operations were considerably larger than the operations for seed wheat purposes. The elevators have done the cleaning and sacking of all the wheat that has been brought into them for seed purposes. In addition to that they have cleaned the screenings and put them into shape for sale to the farmers.

Mr. OLIVER: When you speak of screenings being put in shape for the farmers, does that include the foul seed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, that takes in everything that goes into screenings. The weeds are rendered innocuous as far as germination is concerned by being put through the choppers. The province has

a law in reference to that and we have come to an arrangement with the officers of the provincial government. The arrangement as regards that point fills the law and is satisfactory to the provincial authorities.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there a local demand for the screenings?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, and we provided these choppers so that they could be made available. We commenced sacking for the seed department on February 1 and the following amounts of grain were cleaned and ready for sacking on the date of this statement:

	Bushels.
Seed wheat	250,000
Seed oats	20,000

The rest of it has been cleaned up since this statement was put in. I think it is now pretty nearly all through the cleaning and sacking process and is being distributed. The elevator is equipped with four automatic baggers with a normal capacity of five bags per minute, equal to an output of 24,000 a day of ten hours. The cleaning is done with Richardson cleaners with a capacity of from 11,000 to 15,000 bushels a day of twenty-four hours. The cleaning machinery has been run night and day on seed wheat in order to get it ready for late winter and early spring delivery.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there a drying plant connected with the elevator and, if so, what is its capacity?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, there is drying machinery in connection with it. I do not know what the capacity is but the aim is, as it will be in connection with the others, to have the two elevators absolutely perfect as far as equipment is concerned, so that the treatment, drying, cleaning, bagging and chopping may all be carried on at the central depot.

Mr. OLIVER: In my judgment, probably the most important purpose that the interior elevators could serve would be the drying of damp grain in a season when dampness is the prevailing condition. If my view is correct, it would be necessary that the drying apparatus should be of abnormal capacity as compared with the other functions of the elevator.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is quite true. Our idea of the use and importance of these internal storage elevators has somewhat changed since the idea was first conceived, and we see now that they have other uses than the mere storage of grain, for which they will prove very advantageous to the West. In an abnormal season such as the year before last, when there were vast quantities of wet and damp grain, and we had to bring in at Port Arthur a large drying plant from the United States, and thereby save a large proportion of the grain that would otherwise have been almost a total loss, the drying of grain becomes very important. Even if one of these abnormal seasons comes in the course of every four years only it will be found that these internal storage elevators will have proved a great boon to the country by preserving, through drying and treatment, what otherwise would have been lost. The drying machinery will be adequate for all ordinary purposes, but it is arranged so that if the season turns out to be very abnormal, which can be told some weeks before the urgency for treatment arises, it will be very easy to add an extra drying plant.

The Saskatoon elevator was completed on the 5th of October, and it is well to say that both these elevators were not only well constructed, but that they were constructed and opened ahead of the time specified in the contract. The amount of grain received in the Saskatoon elevator, from the 13th of October to February 1st was: wheat, 540,698 bushels; oats, 702,445 bushels; barley, 14,157 bushels. Shipments in bulk have been made out, up to this date, of about one-eighth of the amount of wheat and about one-seventh of the amount of oats. A large proportion of the wheat and oats was for seed. The commercial wheat in store and shipments out amounted to 177,303 bushels, and of oats 491,779 bushels, showing commercial operations about one-half of the wheat for seed, and twice as much as seed operations in oats. This elevator is equipped with two automatic baggers of the same capacity as those in Moosejaw, and equalling a total of 12,000 bushels a day of ten hours. They have also cleaning and drying apparatus and are therefore equipped in every way for all the eventualities of grain life in the West.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister make a statement with reference to the amendment made to the Grain Act, which I presume was in response to representations made by the lake carriers in regard to weight on receipt and delivery?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend has not read the report of the conference with the delegates who visited the Government, I shall be glad to send him a copy. The whole question had its rise in the difficult problem of adjusting the shortages in lake carrying. The shipper puts his grain into the hands of the Government at Fort William, and it goes into the Government elevator or into elevators which are supervised by the Government. The shipper has no power inside of these elevators; his grain is delivered in trust to these warehouse men. When the grain is ordered out of the warehouse it is weighed out by the elevator into the boat, and the shipper has nothing to do with that operation, which is under Government supervision, or under Government management. The weight of the grain that is put in the vessel is therefore given by the Government weighman and with that grain and that weight the carrier goes on his journey to the eastern elevator. The grain is then weighed out into the eastern elevator, but it is weighed out without Government weighmen and without Government supervision; it is weighed in by the elevator itself into its elevator. If that weight and the weight given at Fort William should agree, there is no trouble between the carrier and the elevator, but if the weight given by the in-weighing or receiving elevator is 1,000 bushels short, then, under past conditions, the carrier had to make up that shortage. The carrier reasoned in this way: that he received from the Government a certain weight of grain at Fort William, that he did not throw it overboard or lose it in any way; but when it was weighed in at the eastern elevator it was short, although he contends that he delivered to the receiving elevator just as much as he got at the loading elevator. Consequently, he demurred against the payment of the shortage. His ground of attack was, that there must be something wrong with the weighing at the loading elevator, or there must be something wrong with the weighing at the unloading elevator. That is the basis of the dispute. The carriers met in convention and came to the conclusion that in this year particularly, having had some heavy losses, and having had all this trouble for years, they would protect themselves by a bill of lading, the essence of which would be that they would not contract with the shipper to make good the shortage, although they would contract to allow a certain percentage as a donation towards this shortage, and beyond that they would not go. They would not make contracts with the shippers except upon that new or modified bill of lading. The shippers did not accede to that arrangement, and took the ground that they were out of it as far as the lake transit was concerned—that, their grain having been delivered to the Government or Government-supervised elevators, and the grain being weighed out to them, the weight was presumably right, and they should not be held responsible. Therefore they refused to go in with the purpose of that bill of lading. Then, it was thought that if all these people would get together, they might come to some fair arrangement to test out some method by which the shortage could be arranged for each year without the multiplied troubles. It ended in this, that the outloading elevators and the lake carriers were prepared to give contributions towards a shortage fund, to ensure the receiving elevators against losses. If there were any losses greater than this fund made up, then they would stand that part of the shortage themselves. A conference of the carriers and elevatormen was held lately in my office, and it was pretty representative. Those who were represented there came to an agreement practically on that basis, and I had hopes that the whole thing would have been settled for this year. The idea was to try out that arrangement for one year; if it worked well, it could be kept on, and if it did not work satisfactorily some other means could be devised. The long and the short of it was that in getting the different representatives from all parts of the country to sign the agreement—the assent of each one was essential to the carrying out of the scheme—delays took place, and I asked them to come together again to see whether we could not come to a final agreement, sign up, and have the whole matter arranged. A number of them came; but it was not a representative meeting. The result is that the situation is about the same as it was before. The question is now engaging the consideration of the officers of my department and of the Government, and before the session closes I hope to bring in an amendment to the Act which will provide some satisfactory way of disposing of shortages, so as to settle the question, if we possibly can, and not have the perennial disputes and troubles and inconveniences which arise from the condition of things that has existed in the past. The shippers, the outloaders and the carriers are agree-

able to having such an amendment; the objection comes from some of the eastern elevators.

Mr. OLIVER: Has the amending Bill not been put through?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. I introduced two amendments into the Senate, when I had hopes that this arrangement by agreement would be made as to the shortages. That Bill has come to the House; and, if any further legislation is necessary, as I think it will be, it will be brought in as an amendment to that Bill, so that when it comes before the House, the three questions will be before us, and then the result can be submitted to the Senate and the legislation finished.

Mr. OLIVER: As I understood the terms of the Bill that came from the Senate, the question of shortage was put squarely up to the carriers.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There was nothing in the Bill with reference to that directly. The Bill had two amendments, one of which was regarding the certificate of weight at Fort William, as given by the Government weighman. At Fort William you have the shipper and the elevator and the vesselman, and some one has to say what weight is put into a vessel. As the Government system of supervision, if I may so say, seems to be rather better than the system of supervision at other elevators, it was the opinion that the weight ascertained and given by or under the supervision of the Government should be the weight that should be taken as final, and that weight would be put up to the receiving elevator. That would not mean that the receiving elevator would have no recourse after that, but that would settle the weight until, by process of investigation by the grain board, before which the matter could go, or further by the courts, if it went to the courts, an ultimate decision could be had.

Mr. OLIVER: As I read the Bill, it seemed to me that if a carrier, having received a certain amount of grain under the supervision of the Government, did not deliver that amount to the receiving elevator, he was absolutely responsible.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He read it, and it was his duty to deliver it to the receiving elevator. The whole point is that, the Government having fixed the weight, it is supposed to be the proper weight and the weight which the carrier must deliver. There might be inaccuracies in weighing the grain at the receiving elevator, and they would have to be determined.

Mr. TURRIFF: As I understand the matter, the Government has officials, not only at the Government elevators, but at all the other elevators doing business at the head of the lakes. Does the Government hold itself responsible for the correct or proper delivering of the grain from the time it is weighed in one of the large terminal elevators until it is transmitted into the hold of a vessel? The wheat is weighed in large hoppers; it has then in most cases to be elevated and to go through quite a system of spouts before it gets into the hold of the vessel, and there may be leakage in many ways. When the Government weigher gives a certificate, is he responsible that the amount of grain goes into the vessel, or is he simply giving a certificate that he has weighed a certain amount of grain?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Take the Government elevator first. When grain comes to a Government elevator, it is taken out of the hands of the shipper there. It is weighed out into the elevator, and the Government elevator is responsible for every pound of grain that goes in; it is responsible for delivering an equal quantity of grain both in weight and in grade; if the grain is spirited out of the elevator in any way, that is to the loss of the elevator. The grain remains in the elevator until it is ordered out, and then the Government officials in the elevator weigh it out, spout it out and supervise it as it goes into the hold of the vessel. They have to weigh out just as much as they take in. If they cannot do that, they have to stand that loss. After it once gets into the hold of the vessel the Government is not responsible for what takes place; it is then the carrier's loss.

Mr. TURRIFF: That would not cover the point I want to get at. Take the case of a terminal elevator other than the Government elevator. There is a Government weigher, and he turns, say, 10,000 bushels of wheat on the scales and gives a certificate to that effect. Does the Government hold itself responsible that all of that 10,000 bushels gets to the hold of the vessel? Because, it is quite possible that grain can be switched between the scale hopper and the hold of the vessel.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Then, that would be the loss of the elevator if such loss was due to its negligence.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not quite so sure. The Grain Act as it stands provides that the weight given by the Government is the weight; but the amendment that has been brought before the House says that the weight as given by the Government shall be the weight in law.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What is that?

Mr. OLIVER: I say, I do not think the conclusion of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) as stated is the correct one. The present law says that the weight given by the Government elevator is the weight. That leaves it a matter to be ultimately decided whether that weight was the lawful weight or not. But, under the amending Bill before the House, it is proposed to say, not only that that is the weight but that it is the lawful weight—that is, there is no recourse as against the weight given by the weigher.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It may be that I can save my hon. friend some argument on that score. He is speaking of the amendment as it came to the House?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That amendment does not express the view of the Department or of the Government. It got in a little wrong, and that was not noticed in the Senate. So, when it comes before the House there is to be an amendment.

I think I shall have to ask my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) to repeat his question to which I gave an answer. It may be that I did not quite understand his question, or it may be that he did not understand my answer; or maybe his question is right and my answer is not right, and I want to have it right.

Mr. TURRIFF: From the information I have received on the subject, I am led to infer that weighers may not be always as correct as they might be. Also that information leads me to point out that discrepancies might occur between the time the wheat is weighed and the time it arrives in the vessel.

4 p.m.

I assume that in a Government elevator matters go more nearly correct than in an ordinary commercial elevator. But in an ordinary commercial elevator the Government puts in official weighers. Take the case of such an elevator, and a shipment, say, of 10,000 bushels of wheat, is ordered out. The Government weigher weighs that wheat and it is sent to the hold of the vessel. But what I am asking is: Does the Government hold itself responsible that it is 10,000 bushels of wheat that is weighed out by their own weigher, or does the Government see to it that every bushel of that 10,000 bushels gets to the hold of the vessel? It is shipped as 10,000 bushels; but from the weigh-scale hopper in the elevator to the hold of the vessel that wheat has to be elevated, and lowered, and switched around to a very considerable extent, more particularly in the old elevators built fifteen or twenty years ago. So, I am trying to find out if the Government looks after that wheat from the time it leaves the scale hopper to the time it gets to the hold of the vessel.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government receives the grain, as I stated before. The grain is ordered out, and they weigh it. They weigh out the exact quantity that is ordered. Now, after it passes the weigh-scale, my hon. friend wants to know whether the Government sees to it that every grain of that is carried into the hold and gets there—

Mr. TURRIFF: Every bushel—yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:—and whether, if every bushel does not get into the hold, the Government is responsible for all that does not get in. I have asked that question of Dr. Magill, and have given him the facts, and have asked him to write out a statement, so that there may be no question about it. What he has written is as follows:

1. The inspector drops an electric light into the shipping bin, to see that the bin is emptied into the hold.

That is the first thing that is done.

2. An officer stands on the dock and sees the spouts handled, and shakes them out. The inspectors watch the belts and number the shipping bins for each boat.

These are the precautions which the Government takes in its own elevators with its own men; and these are the precautions which are taken in every elevator that loads out at Fort William. If anything goes wrong and it is between the weighing-scales and the hold of the vessel, and it is possible for this inspection and supervision to spot it, then, of course, the responsibility falls on the elevator, and they would be made to, as we say, "pony

up." But with the Government elevator nothing is supposed to go wrong.

Mr. OLIVER: Why is it that while the Government supervise the weighing and delivery of all outgoing grain from the terminal elevators, they do not supervise the transfer of grain from the hold of the vessel to the eastern receiving elevator?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The bent of the department and its administration being towards a proper inspection and certification of grain, as the years have passed by that inspection and certification has been brought to a state of efficiency which, perhaps, we shall not be able to exceed, taking the human element into account. But it is equally important—and, in some cases, more important—that attention should be given to the weighing of the grain, because if the weight is defective the farmer and the shipper may lose large amounts on large transactions. There are difficulties in connection with the weighing of grain. The grain is weighed in, we will say, at a country elevator; then it goes to Winnipeg, and, ultimately, to Fort William, where it comes under the supervision of government weighmen. The scales in all country elevators are under the control of the Inland Revenue Department, and inspection of them, is, therefore, carried out by that department. Up to the present time inspection has been made about once a year, and my hon. friend knows how easy it is for scales to get out of order.

Mr. OLIVER: When the Estimates of the Minister of Inland Revenue were under consideration, I drew his attention pointedly to that condition.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That has been taken up, to a certain extent, by the two departments concerned. I have no hesitation in saying that it would conduce to the efficiency of the service if both these operations were under the control of one department, that department naturally being the one which has the most to do with the grain. So far, we have not decided to do that, but certain steps have been taken in the matter. In the first place, the Inland Revenue Department has arranged for more frequent and more thorough inspections of the scales in the western division, including the elevators at the terminals. In the second place, we have ourselves obtained from the Inland Revenue Department authority to inspect and supervise the scales in the terminals at Fort William. The chief weighmaster at this terminal—he is a scalemaker, knows all about scales, and is a very energetic and efficient man—has supervision of all scales at Fort William. The weighing at Fort William has been greatly improved within the last year or two, and, I dare say, is susceptible of still further improvement. At first attention was directed chiefly to the West, the centre and source of the grain, but gradually it became apparent that something would have to be done in the East as well in order to make the system continuously efficient. Eastern inspection and weighing, particularly the weighing, has not been under the supervision of the Government to the extent that it ought to have been. There is no Government weighing-out from the vessels into the receiving elevator; we do employ weighmen in some eastern elevators who supervise the weighing-out from the receiving elevators into the cars. An Order in Council was passed last year which looked towards bringing the eastern system, in respect of weights particularly, into conformity with the western system. The matter is complicated a little by the fact that the elevator systems of the East differ from those of the West; the Harbour Commissioners have their elevators and manage them, and it takes a little time to get all these interests in agreement and in accord, so that the system shall be made to work smoothly and efficiently all the way through. I hope, however, that before another session of Parliament is held, our efforts in that direction will have resulted in the securing of a more uniform and efficient system.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I cannot understand why there should be many shortages at the eastern elevators. If a vessel has 100,000 bushels of grain for an eastern elevator, exactly that amount is bound to be delivered, and the mate goes up to the weigh scales and checks the amount very closely in order to establish that the requisite amount of grain has been delivered. You have, therefore, that first check on the part of the vessel owner. In order to avoid dispute between the owner of the vessel and himself, the owner of the elevator also has a man there to check the incoming quantity of grain; that is check No. 2. These elevators contain a great many bins, the capacity of each bin being from 20,000 to 50,000 bushels of grain, and a cargo of say 100,000 bushels of grain can be placed in two or three bins.

There is in the office—and I know this

from living where there are elevators—a model so to speak which shows exactly the grain of each vessel, and the numbers of the bins in which it is distribued. We will assume that John Brown of Peterborough owns a hundred thousand bushels that came on the steamer Rosedale. That grain is deposited in bins 1, 2, 3 and 4, we will suppose. The bins may not all be full, but each contains part of the grain. Now when the order comes in to ship that grain it is drawn from the elevator in cars, and it is there that the Government weighman comes in to see that the right quantity goes into the cars. The grain drops out of all elevators from the bottom, and when the four bins are empty that proves that all the grain of John Brown, or whoever it is, has has gone out. If there is not enough grain to fill John Brown's order, the vendor can very speedily get an inquiry into the matter, and unless the grain has been there for a considerable length of time the shortage, if any, is easily ascertained. I live where there are elevators, but I do not think there are a great many shortages after all, and some that I have heard of were—say 500 bushels out. That meant that the tallyman had forgotten one tally. Of course the shortage might be only 200 bushels; that depends on the scale. But the grain is very well watched both by the owner of the vessel and the owner of the elevator.

Mr. TURRIFF: The discussion so far has been largely, I imagine, on the outgoing weighing from the terminal elevators. The efforts that have been made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce are in the right direction, and I think the system is being gradually improved, and that before long it ought to be very complete. There is, however, a considerable amount of complaint about the weighing of wheat at the original elevator where the farmer places it, and at the terminal elevators at the head of the lakes, and possibly the present will be as good a time to discuss this matter as on the amending Bill that my hon. friend is bringing in. I do not know that I can do better than read a letter on the subject that I have just received, and that seems to me very much to the point. It shows what the difficulties and the losses are, and gives the writer's opinion how they could best be avoided. The letter is from Mr. D. D. Campbell, Room 246, Grain Exchange, Winnipeg, Manitoba, and is dated January 13, 1915:

J. G. Turriff, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:

I see that it is expected that the Dominion House will soon open for business, and I understand that there are likely to be some changes made in the Grain Act, and it is possible that the Board of Grain Commissioners may be asking for more power to be given them in dealing with matters that may be all right in some cases, but if I had an hour's talk with you I think I could convince you that there never was a time when more definite action is necessary in securing redress from the errors that are continually occurring, especially in weights, both of car lots, and also in cargo lots.

The farmers and dealers in the West have far more reason to start a rebellion over the weights they are receiving for their grain than there was for the war which is now raging in Europe. You may say we have the Grain Commission to apply to, and in reply I say we have applied to them, but without results, as the facts which I will state will go to prove. I say without fear of successful contradiction, that conditions never were so bad as they are at the present time, and I have been closely in touch with the grain handling for the past thirty years.

A little over a year ago I took up the work of collecting claims for different grain firms, and also for farmers that desired my assistance, and in that time I have secured adjustments in weight for the following amounts of grain, by proving to the satisfaction of those in charge that the weights as issued were not correct.

I secured 20,000 pounds of wheat, 10,000 pounds of wheat, 404 bushels of flax, 466.28 bushels of oats, 234 bushels of oats, 95 bushels of flax, 136 bushels of wheat, 100 bushels of wheat, 1[illegible]3.40 bushels of wheat, 55 bushels of wheat; and I could name a good many more on which I have received adjustments. But some of the terminals refuse to make any adjustment, even though the facts are very clear that an error has occurred, but shield themselves behind the so-called Government weight. And the recent investigations that have been held in regard to cargo lots show that some cargoes had thousands of bushels over in weight, and others were found to be short to a large extent.

In fact conditions have got so bad that the railway companies are taking the stand that terminal weights cannot be relied on, and refuse to pay claims for shortages in weight, even where weights have been sworn to as the car was loaded—unless the car has been seen leaking in transit. As an example, I have seven cars which were all handled in about ten days. The grain was weighed in by Government weight at St. Boniface, and weighed off at Fort William by Government weight; and the shortage on the seven cars is 14,330 pounds. This occurred nearly a year ago, but the claims are not paid yet.

I think the foregoing will clearly show that there is something wrong. What is the remedy? I am prepared to admit that J. G. White, the chief weighmaster at Fort William, is one of the best scale experts in Canada, but I think the facts which I have given show clearly that it is not the scales that cause the errors, but the connections getting the grain

to and from the scales, by the men in charge. You know from practical experience that there is not much to be gained in having good hooks on a chain, unless every link is capable of standing the strain; as the strength of any chain is its weakest link. I claim that we are not paying salaries enough to get men of the right type to take up this work. I claim that there is not a bank manager in Fort William that has any more responsible position than the weighman in one of the large terminal elevators. Note the conditions under which they work and the salaries paid. Is it any wonder that we are not securing accurate weights?

We require a Dominion Utilities Commissioner, with full power to inquire into all troubles arising between the railways and the terminal elevators, who would have full power to give a ruling as to where the responsibility rests, and order an adjustment of same. For the average shipper cannot afford to stand a suit in court with a large corporation. I will state a few cases as an example:

A farmer loads 1,100 bushels into a car, and has kept correct record of his weights. The record taken in passing Winnipeg by the Inspection Department goes to show that the car contained the amount claimed. When the car is placed at the elevator for unloading, the record shows that one of the seals on the door of the car is gone, and the outturn of the car is over 100 bushels short. The railway company refuse to pay the claim on the ground that their records show sign of leak or damage in transit, and they claim the car was sealed when placed on the elevator siding. Who is responsible for the loss?

A car is loaded with oats, in Alberta, and consigned to Montreal. This car was first handled by the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, as far as Fort William, and taken to Montreal by the Canadian Pacific railway. The outturn shows a loss of nearly $200. Both railways decline any responsibility for the loss on the ground that there was no record of leak while the car was in their possession.

At the time that this car was handled, there was a clause in the Grain Act, as follows: "No grain shall leave a public terminal point without being officially weighed, unless the owner or his agent orders otherwise."

This car was not weighed, and the Grand Trunk Pacific claim that if it was to be weighed it would be the Canadian Pacific railway that should attend to the weighing, and the Canadian Pacific railway claim that the weighing should have been done by the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. This car was handled in 1913 and is not settled yet.

A car of flax loaded in Saskatchewan and consigned to Fort William was noted on arrival at Winnipeg to have been loaded to the wheat line, which is 65 inches high (or supposed to be). On arrival at Fort William the record was taken on two occasions as being 67 inches deep, which is slightly more than the record taken at Winnipeg. The record shows that this car arrived at destination with one of the doors unsealed. The car was unloaded, and the weight given as 61,800 pounds, which is altogether too light a weight for either 65 or 67 inches of flax, and the record of depth is changed to 47 inches by writing a four over the six. The weight sheet shows this car to have been loaded 67 inches deep, and the Canadian Pacific railway refuse to pay the loss claimed on the ground that the record of the car shows that they delivered the flax to the elevator, and the Elevator Company refuse to make good the loss, on the plea that the record of 47 inches which was arrived at after the car was unloaded is correct. Loss claimed is $429.70.

It is possible that the Board of Grain Commissioners may ask for authority to give a ruling in cases of this kind, but I do not think that it will be consistent, as they would be simply giving a decision on the work done by their own employees, and the last case stated here occurred at the Government elevator, which is operated by the Board of Grain Commissioners. So I think you will see that we require an independent party to decide where the responsibility rests, and whose decision would be final and binding on all concerned.

If it is necessary to secure redress, raise the weighing and inspection charges to $1 for each. That will amount to less than a quarter of a cent per bushel, and if we can secure accuracy by doing so, by all means let us have it.

I presume that will be $1 for each car.

While acting as shippers' agent, I took the ground that we were not paying sufficient salaries to secure the best men. There is twice as much work and three times the responsibility in weighing and inspecting a car as there is in selling it on commission, and at present we pay for weighing 30 cents per car, and 50 cents for inspecting it, and we pay our commission firm, say from $10 to $20, and no one begrudges the commission firm their charge if they look well after the selling of same.

There is no reason why this matter cannot be overcome if it is gone after in the proper manner.

You will see that this has reference more particularly to the case of dealers and farmers. Dealers are in a much better position than farmers to secure redress for anything that is wrong. In the first place, the railway companies are much more likely to make a fair settlement with a large firm of dealers, or the big millers, than with the individual farmer. In the second place, the dealers and millers are wealthy corporations as a rule, and they are in shape to put up a big fight in the courts if they do not get a fair settlement. On the other hand, a farmer who has suffered a loss of $100, or $400 or $500, is bandied about from one railway company to another, from one elevator company to another, or from an elevator company to a railway company, and under these circumstances, what possible chance has he to get a fair settlement of his claim? He cannot possibly get a settlement unless he takes the case into court, and there is not one farmer in a hundred who would want to do that. There are very few farmers who would be in a position to do it. It might

cost a good deal more to collect $100 or $200 than the amount collected. This writer suggests that there should be an independent authority appointed to deal with these matters. It seems to me that there is something in his contention. He mentions cases, and he is prepared to supply the necessary proof in every case, where claims have been outstanding since 1913 and are not settled yet. It seems to me that this is not fair, and if my hon. friend would take this matter up, even now before his amended Bill goes through, something might be done to overcome the difficulties. You will notice that the writer of this letter thinks that it is not the Board of Grain Commissioners who should deal with these matters. There is a good deal of reason in what he says; they would simply be siting in judgment on their own employees. That should not perhaps be given too much weight to, but at the same time there is something in it. A man who would be absolutely independent after all would probably be better able to arrive at what is fair and right than anybody else. I have known the writer of this letter for the last thirty-six years. We settled on adjoining sections in the year 1878, some thirty-six years ago. I have known him intimately ever since, and I am sure my hon. friend the member for Lisgar (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) will bear me out when I say that D. D. Campbell is as straightforward and as reliable a man as there is in Canada. He is thoroughly well posted in this business, and I would ask the minister to give every possible consideration to the suggestion he makes, and that if possible, when he comes to take up his Bill to amend the Grain Act, he shall do something along the lines suggested, more particularly in the interest of the farmer and of the individual shipper, as he is not in as good a position to look after his own interest as is the grain dealer or miller.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. member who has just spoken was good enough to allow me to see the letter yesterday, and I had an opportunity of reading it over. He has read it to the committee, and it will go upon the record and will be there for further reference and consideration. There are two remarks in the letter which would lead me to think that as good a man as Mr. Campbell is, he is carried away a little by his fervour, wherein he says that conditions were never as bad as now, and also that they are so bad that they would be as much a justification for a rebellion in the West as are the grounds on which the present war is being waged by the Allies against their enemies. This is more, I think, for the purpose of attracting attention than to be regarded as a statement of fact. My officers on the ground and the members of the commission, I think, have at heart the best interests of the farmers of the West in respect to all these things.

Mr. TURRIFF: There is no doubt about that at all.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They have very carefully watched the matter and have improved methods in every possible way. Their statement to me is that last year showed less grievances and complaints than any preceding year, not only with reference to leakages and weights and certificates and loading platforms and car shortage, but also in regard to every other thing that comes up as a difficulty in this great transportation system. I should be inclined to take the testimony of men who are every day looking over the whole field, rather than that of my friend who wrote the letter, and who sees, as it were, just a confined area, and has his eye particularly upon his own line of redress of grievances. Consider the human element that enters into it: you have railway systems of tens of thousands of miles stretching from the Rocky Mountains to the Lakes, and on every one of these systems are cars which carry grain, and the cars may be of wood and other perishable material, and there are good cars and cars that are not so good, and there will be accidents, leakages, and times when the man who breaks the seal and makes inspection forgets to put the seal on again. All these things occur, and so long as the human element enters into it, they will occur. It is for us to see that there is the necessary efficient supervision, and we can strengthen the supervision and method by which grievances are to be met and complaints are to be investigated, and we can come to greater perfection, but I do not expect that we will ever arrive at a time in the transportation of grain when everybody will be bereft of a grievance. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) would live in the West fifteen minutes if he did not have some little grievance he could get hold of now and then, in order to keep him alive and quicken his activities.

Mr. TURRIFF: We do not have to look far for grievances.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not finding fault. The Grain Commission, with the full approval of the department, has been bending its energies to the improvement of the weighing system and to the status of the weighmen. The inspecting system has been brought to a very good standard, and now the weighmen have to be looked after. We found the weighmen all temporary employees, with no certainty of how long they would be employed. We found that when the number of men who offered themselves were all combed over to get the best of them for inspectors, the remainder were thought good enough to be weighmen. We have changed that and we are making the weighman a permanent rather than a temporary officer.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is good.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The salaries we pay them may not be high, but we have fixed a minimum and a maximum, the minimum being $75 a month and the maximum $100 a month, and if they prove satisfactory their salaries are gradually increased from the minimum to the maximum. They are therefore very much better off than they were before, and we are getting every year a better class of weighmen. Again the human element comes in and mistakes will be made. With reference to these seven cars that went from St. Boniface down to Fort William, I can tell my hon. friend that we might possibly avoid any mistake if at St. Boniface we could see that every grain went into the cars, and if we put a man at the head of the car and another at the tail of the car, and got them to keep track and watch the sides of the car until it got to Fort William, and then saw that every grain of that get into the elevator was weighed at Fort William. In that way you would have supervision all the way through and you might come near perfection, but of course that process is impossible. I do not know that the time will ever come when a corporation will pay all claims until it is compelled to, and no man likes to pay until he makes certain that he ought to pay. To remedy these difficulties the writer of the letter says that a man should be appointed who would be an autocrat and a czar, and that when he investigates, the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the elevators, have got to do just as he says and make restitution as he declares. It goes a long way to say that the one man shall investigate and pass sentence, and leave no recourse to the other party for appeal or for courts of law. We have to be pretty careful as to how far we should go in that direction. Our commission could have these complaints made to them and they could investigate and they could report, but they have no power to enforce, and it is a pretty grave question as to whether you should give any man or any body of men the absolute right just of themselves to say to other parties what they should do in certain cases, without leaving the other parties any recourse of appeal. I would be glad if it could be made possible that none of these difficulties would occur, but after all we can only take a comparative view. These are the points that the writer of the letter passes upon, that came within his experience, but count them all up and how few they are in comparison with the innumerable transactions that take place in grain every year in Canada. That does not say that there may be a good many claims that are not brought to the surface, and which would swell that number. It is always a right thing for a minister to say that he will look into the circumstances and that he will take into consideration whatever view is placed before him, and he ought to do it and to do it honestly. If he finds there is anything in a suggestion which can be practically carried out, it is his duty to try and do it, and he must exercise his judgment in that respect. I know that Mr. Campbell was once in the employ of the Government in this class of business, and his work came under my notice, and so far as his work is concerned I think it was done conscientiously and with a desire to do his whole duty.

Mr. TURRIFF: If the recommendations which Mr. Campbell makes were carried out, it would cut away his business, so that he cannot be making them from any personal motive. I have every confidence in the way in which the minister is endeavouring to help matters along in that respect, and I have every confidence that he is doing his best to get the law into good shape so that if the farmers do make a loss they will have their remedy. I still think that in the case of the seven cars there ought to be a decision one way or the other long before this.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I quite agree. Of course, as to the management of the interior terminal elevators it is so far an experiment. These elevators have a capacity of 3,500,000 bushels of grain storage, and the object is to get the farmers of that part of the country interested in these elevators so

as to study out what possible advantage they may be to them. In order to facilitate that, one of our travelling inspectors, who as regards grain has little to do in the winter months, has been making a tour of the Northwest provinces. He has a nice set of lantern slides which show the construction of the elevators and their workings and give general representations of the mechanical conditions of the transport system. He calls meetings and exhibits the lantern slides and gives the farmers present an address upon the storage elevators—what they are designed for, what it is proposed to do with them, and in what way the farmers may make use of them to their own advantage. I am informed that these meetings are attended with very great interest by large numbers of the farmers. We are also sending out little illustrated pamphlets about the working of our elevators, with the terms, etc., to the farmers of the West, all with the idea of getting the farmers to focus their attention upon the Government elevators to see of what use they may be to them. The management is arranging the fees and charges in such a way as to make it an inducement to the farmer to send his grain to the Government elevators. In the arranging of the fees and charges we are for the present absorbing the stop-over charge in the transport system; and, when you take our line of charges, it is possible for the western farmer to put his grain into the storage elevator and have it remain there for 45 days, and then send it forward to our elevator at Fort William and have it transferred to that elevator, all at a total charge which is less than it will cost him to send his grain through the elevators directly to a terminal elevator at Fort William. We think, when that is fully understood, it will have two results. In the first place, it will have this best result: it will give an opportunity to the farmer to avail himself of a space of time for the storage of his grain and prevent him from throwing it absolutely and quickly upon the market when it is threshed, because he has no opportunity for storing it. It will thus conduce gradually to the conservation of grain from being rushed on to the market too quickly and sold, thus diminishing the prices which are offered. It offers this inducement also to the farmer, that he can have his grain cleaned and treated and, if it is out of condition, put into condition, all at a comparatively low rate. These are some of the advantages which we are offering to the farmers in connection with the internal storage elevators.

Mr. OLIVER: There is nothing to be said in condemnation of the idea of the minister to give all publicity possible to whatever advantages there may be in the existence of these internal storage elevators; but the condition remains as it was in the beginning that in the exceptional year the elevators will be used largely, and in the ordinary years they will be used very little, as in the case of the present year as shown by the returns that my hon. friend has given. With three railroad systems operating four tracks to Lake Superior during the summer and three tracks to tide-water during the winter, the conditions which existed some years ago and which were made the original basis of the idea of establishing interior terminal elevators, will have been radically changed; so that whatever reasons there may have been some years ago for the establishment of these storage elevators for storage purposes, those reasons are not now so strong to-day as they were then. I am not finding fault with the Government for establishing the elevators. They will be found to be of use in the exceptional year, but they are not a substitution, nor can they ever be made a substitution in any sense for the original demand made on behalf of the farmers for Government-ownership of all the terminal elevators at Lake Superior.

I wish to say a word in regard to the matter brought up by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). While I want to join the hon. member in what he said as to the minister's good faith in his effort to improve the conditions of the grain trade and of grain transport under the administration of his department, and while I have every confidence in the good intentions of the minister, at the same time I am bound to say that, as I followed his argument, I was reminded of the argument made a few minutes ago by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) when dealing with the grievances of the lake-carriers and the difficulties of weighing at the receiving elevators. The conditions complained of in the letter that my hon. friend from Assiniboia read is exactly parallel to that complained of by the lake carriers, which has been the cause of serious disputes between the elevator people and the grain shippers, and which is to be made the basis of legislation by the Government

during this session. The difference is that in the cases brought to the attention of the Government by the hon. member for Assiniboia, the complainant or victim is the individual farmer or the small shipper, whereas in the case of the grain carriers, the complainant is a large organization which has capital and means of bringing what grievances it has to the attention of the Government or indeed of forcing them upon the attention of any government. Some people say that because it is the individual farmer or small grain shipper who suffers a loss because of leakage or shortage between the interior elevator and the terminals, it is a small matter; but I maintain that, for the success of the Government policy in regard to elevators, it is a more important question than that of the dispute between the carriers and the elevators. If the Government has any purpose in operating the elevator at Fort William, it is to encourage the individual farmer to ship his grain direct, and to give the farmer all the profit that it is possible for him to receive out of the production and marketing of his grain. If the farmer who ships from his local siding either through a local elevator or from an elevated platform, is liable to be robbed of his grain in transit without recourse, then he is certainly going to be deterred from shipping. And the purpose of the terminal elevator at Fort William is not going to be served. It is not possible to prevent leakages, but it is possible to make the railway company absolutely responsible for any leakages that occur; just as the legislation which is not to be passed, but which is now before Parliament, makes the lake carrier absolutely responsible for any leakage that may occur. When the railway company receives so much grain from the loading platform or the elevator they should turn out that amount of grain at the terminal elevator; and if they lose the grain it should be their loss and not that of the farmer. If the grain is loaded from the platform into the cars, the weight taken at that place, if it is possible to take it, should govern as to the outturn at the other end. That is the object to be achieved, and if it cannot be achieved under present legislation then I think legislation should be provided under which it could be achieved.

Mr. WRIGHT: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how he would determine the weight that goes into the car that is loaded, not at the local elevator but over the platform?

Mr. OLIVER: I understand that there is no particular difficulty in weighing the grain into the car from the elevator.

Mr. WRIGHT: The hon. gentleman was pointing out the difficulty of determining the loss to the farmer who might ship from the local elevator or from the loading platform. If the farmer ships his wheat through the local elevator, he has his weights taken, and has his records. These absolutely determine what he has put through the elevator. But if he ships it over the loading platform, there is no way that I know of to determine the weight. I do not know of any way of determining that weight before it gets to the Government weigher at the terminal elevator. That is one of the difficulties the farmer is up against. Loading over the platform, there is no way by which the farmer can determine the weight unless he takes it to a local scale and has each load weighed separately. He has those weights to guide in determining the weight of the whole load in the car, and that might determine it with some measure of accuracy.

I did not quite understand the minister, and while I am on my feet I would like to ask him with regard to a statement he made that a certain time was given to the farmer free who put his grain through the elevators erected at Saskatoon or Moosejaw. But a great deal of the grain of the West is produced at points east of these elevators, and so many of the producers of grain could not make use of them. Would the same length of time be allowed free to the farmer who ships his grain direct to the terminal elevator at Fort William?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The charge for elevating into the elevators in the West is made low, and the elevating charge covers storage for a certain number of days.

Mr. WRIGHT: Does that apply to the terminal elevator as well as the interior elevators?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: For grain that is taken out of the interior elevator and transferred to the elevator at Fort William the charge is a lower charge, and that carries with it free storage for a certain number of days.

5 p.m.

Mr. WRIGHT: The hon. gentleman has not quite answered my question. If the

farmer ships direct to the terminal elevator at Fort William, what time would he have?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Fifteen days—exactly the same as in the other case.

Mr. OLIVER: In regard to the point raised by my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. Wright), certainly if the farmer cannot have a definite weight or measure on shipment, he cannot expect a definite recourse on outturn. But if he can get such a definite weight on shipment, then I say he should have a definite weight on outturn and if he cannot get weight he certainly can get measure. For, when the car is loaded from the loading platform and levelled off, and a chalk line is drawn all around the car at the level of the grain, if, when the car gets to Fort William it is not up to that measure —that is, allowing for a certain amount of shrinkage— that is proof that there has been leakage. So, the farmer could have a weight, or he could have a measure, beyond any question. There is an instance mentioned by the writer of this letter, of grain actually weighed by the Government weigher at Winnipeg and weighed again by the Government weigher at Fort William, and the shipper had to stand the loss for leakage on the way.

Mr. WRIGHT: It could not be weighed at Winnipeg. The only way would be to weigh the loads and take what tare may happen to be written on the outside of the car. But the only place where it can be weighed definitely is at Fort William, or wherever it is unloaded. If the grain were unloaded at Winnipeg, going to a local mill or something of that kind, then the weight at Winnipeg could be accurately ascertained. But the average man shipping his grain to Fort William would have no means of determining the weight of his grain at Winnipeg, outside of taking the cars at their actual tare and deducting that from the gross weight. The weight of the grain is always determined at Fort William; the inspection is done at Winnipeg and Fort William. But there is no way of determining the weight of the grain at Winnipeg.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not shipping the grain, nor am I handling the elevator; I am simply saying that Mr. Campbell mentioned a certain instance. If I remember his letter correctly, he said that a certain amount of grain, having been weighed at Fort William—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: St. Boniface.

Mr. OLIVER: St. Boniface—showed a loss in transit, and that loss had not been made good by the railway company up to date, though the shipment was made nearly a year ago. He urged that there should be some officer appointed by the Government with arbitrary power to make an order in regard to such shortage and enforce the order. Now, I am not going to argue that the Grain Commission itself should not have that power—that this should not be one part of the responsibilities of the Grain Commission. I think the idea of the writer of the letter was that the Grain Commission, being itself in the grain business, so to speak, was not, in all cases, the proper party to render such a decision.

That may be a very fine point, but I think that for the time being most of us would be very glad to give the Grain Commission authority to inquire into and enforce awards in regard to shortages in transit. Above everything else, let the decision be without appeal. In no department of the administration of the law is there greater denial of justice than there is in the unlimited right of appeal. There is no reason why the decision given in the first place should not stand; it is a decision of the human mind anyway, and the chances are that the human mind which had first knowledge of the transaction is the one best qualified to give final decision. So I say that the minister will be well advised if he takes seriously into consideration the complaint voiced by Mr. Campbell, asking for protection to the small shipper in the matter of grain shortages in transit, and that authority be vested in the Grain Commission or in some other body to inquire into and to enforce decisions in regard to the responsibility for these losses. The loss of 100 bushels may, perhaps, be a small thing in a shipment of 150,000,000 bushels of grain, but to the farmer it may mean the loss of his profit on the whole year's work. It is a small thing in the aggregate, but it is a tremendously big thing to him, and his experience will affect the action of a large number of his neighbours. The matter, therefore, has more importance than that assigned to it by the minister. While I give him every credit for good faith in the desire to administer his department well, he will pardon me, as more directly representing the people who are affected by this condition, for pressing their views upon him perhaps somewhat pointedly.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no objection to the matter being pressed, but

I desire to place another view alongside that which has been put forward by my hon. friend. Your man in the West ships a crate of eggs to Winnipeg. He entrusts that shipment to the railway, gets his bill of lading, and the railway has to deliver the goods at the other end. He has a shipment of poultry or crockeryware coming from the east; to all these shipments is applied the common law that regulates the carrying system of this country. All shipments, whether large or small, must be delivered at their destination by the carrier, and if they are not delivered in good form or not delivered at all, recourse is had by the shipper against the carrier. The farmer who deals in grain or in anything else is subject to the same law; he entrusts his shipment to the carrier; the carrier undertakes to deliver that shipment at its destination, and if he does not deliver it he has to account to the man who ships. It is always the case that the man who ships a dozen eggs is not in as good a position to press his claim as the man who ships a million dozen; the big trader will always have the advantage in making terms or in enforcing his claims against the carrier. That is the common lot of all of us, in every condition of life.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE: I think that the conditions affecting the grain trade are just a little different from those which apply to the things that the hon. minister has just mentioned. We have a grain commission to handle the grain trade of Western Canada, and if that grain commission are going to handle part of the grain, I think they should handle all of it. If, as Mr. Campbell states, grain was weighed in St. Boniface and again at Fort William or Port Arthur, and a loss of three or four hundred bushels was disclosed, it seems to me that it is plain that the railway company should make good that loss.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We all agree on that.

Mr. SHARPE: I do not see why all these cases should not be put in the hands of the Grain Commission; as a matter of fact, I think I remember instances in which the Grain Commission interfered in cases of this kind and succeeded in getting the railway companies to make good the losses that had been sustained. I think that the whole of the grain trade, not merely part of it, should be put in the hands of the Grain Commission.

[Sir G. E. Foster.]

Mr. McKENZIE: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the addresses delivered this afternoon; particularly am I interested in the paternal solicitude which is exercised by the Government and by the minister over the farmers of the West. Great care is taken that everything is done for the western farmer; with the eaestern farmer it is quite different. I should like to know what is the quid pro quo for the miner and the fisherman and the lumberman in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island who pay their fair share of all this money that is being expended in the West? I remember that as far back as 1881 we started to put our money into the West for the development of the land and of railways, and so forth, and we have been continually doing it ever since. And now we are spending our money in paying commissioners and other officials to see that the farmer of the West is protected. The story in the East has always been that we should give for the purpose of developing the West, so that it might become the granary of the world, that foodstuffs would become cheaper by reason of the enormous amount of money we were spending in the West, and that flour, which thirty years ago was dear in the Maritime Provinces, would certainly become cheaper. But after twenty-five or thirty years' experience we find that flour instead of getting cheaper is getting dearer. In fact, I do not remember any time when flour was as dear in Eastern Canada as it is to-day. If any miner in my part of the country who is paying $9 or $9.50 a barrel for flour asks me what has become of all the money that he contributed in the way of duties on flour and woollen goods and almost everything that he and his family uses, I am not in a position to tell him. But we pay commissioners and ministers and others to get this information, and I hope the minister this afternoon will be able to put on Hansard something that I can tell the lumbermen and miners of Nova Scotia when they ask me what has become of their money and how it is that flour is getting dearer instead of cheaper. I wish the minister and the Government would show some solicitude and following care, if I may so call it, over the grain till it becomes flour, and after it becomes flour till it gets into the store and is sold to the miner and the fisherman who has no middleman at all, but has to depend on his own capacity to make the best bargain possible. It looks to me as if there was

some combination of millers or flour merchants who are putting up unnecessarily the price of flour. This discussion came up in the House a few weeks ago on a motion of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) that there should be some control over these prices. It is a difficult matter of course. But we have a Railway Commission in this country, and the origin and the principle of the formation of that commission was to have some control over freight rates. That Commission became necessary after twenty or thirty years of experience in this country. Why, then, should there not be some control over the price of flour? There may be a difficulty in doing it, but all the greater necessity for dealing with it; and I believe the day will come when it will be necessary to have a Commission in this country to deal with the question of the prices of flour and all the other commodities that the people must have.

Mr. BLAIN: May I ask whether there was any complaint about the high price of flour before the war? My impression is that the price of flour was not very high in Canada before the war began.

Mr. McKENZIE: Oh, yes. For the last two years in our part of the country the price of flour has been gradually rising, and for at least nine months or a year before the war there was a very strong cry in our part of the country that the price of flour was inordinately high. Yet we are told here that there is an abundance of wheat in the country, more than we can hope to sell to the people who are very much affected by the war. And that being the case, I am afraid that this cry of the war is simply made the occasion for millers and others to put up the price. If we have more wheat than we can export, if we have plenty of mills and plenty of wheat, I do not see that the mere fact of war should be an excuse or a reason for inordinatly putting up the prices. What I wanted to submit to the minister was that when the fisherman in Nova Scotia has fish to sell he must look after it himself. He must find a market for himself, and if any of it is lost in transit he has to find his way through the courts as best he can. There is no commission or machinery of any kind whatever to help the fisherman in selling his goods, and the same with the lumberman and the miner. They have contributed money in large amounts towards the development of the West, but they have to look out for themselves the best way they can. We are all glad that the West is developing, but I am not making a far-fetched argument when I say that the contention in Eastern Canada always was, as the minister knows, that the day would come when the enormous development of the West would give us cheap flour, cheap foodstuffs, and so forth. I say that there should be strong oversight at all events, over the grain from the time it leaves the farmer until it is put in the flour barrel, and after it is put in the flour barrel, until it is sold to the miner or the lumberman or the fisherman, who must buy it at the price it is offered. If the machinery of the minister's department is not sufficient to supervise these matters, the people are willing to pay for any further instruments that he may bring to his aid in keeping these things right. At all events we hope and expect him to be in a position to tell the people of this country that the prices are too high. Even if he does not interfere with any machinery, by way of a commission or otherwise, he should tell the people that the prices are too high, and then it would be time to see whether or not there was a combination and the proper remedy to apply.

Mr. MORPHY: Do the fishermen of the province of Nova Scotia use western flour in the pure state, without blending?

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, there is no other flour for them to buy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not propose to follow up by way of answer the sectional appeal made by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). I do not propose to follow up his complaint that this Government is too solicitous of the good of the western farmer. I am very proud to say they have been solicitous, but I refer his complaint to better hands. I leave it to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and I know they will reply to it in much more forceful language than I could use. I am also hopeful that their appeal to him will have more effect than any I could make. Perhaps I could suggest to the hon. member that we pay out annual bounties from the treasury to the fishermen, about one-half of whom I think are in the hon. gentleman's own province. We are very glad to pay those bounties, and none of us grudge them in the least. but there is no corresponding bounty in connection with any other industry in our country.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the hon. gentleman know the origin of those bounties?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am quite aware that they are paid out of the revenue from an award which was made by a tribunal.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is Yankee money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That award, when it was made, was the property of the whole Canadian people, and if any had a particular interest in it, it would be the fishermen of earlier days, and not the fishermen of subsequent times. However, that question does not arise, because no one for the purposes of this debate questions the propriety of it at all. What I rose to say was this: The hon. member for Edmonton has offered some observations on the advisability of the Grain Commission having the control and disposition of shortages and overages arising chiefly through carriage by water, and to some extent also through carriage on land.

He has argued that it would be well were the grain commission given power to fix responsibility and assess the proportion in which the shortages should be borne. On the other hand, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce argues that that would be departing from the general scheme of fixing responsibilities, and that dealers in western grain have no more right to appeal to another tribunal in respect to grain than they would have in respect to other commodities or than citizens in other parts of Canada would have in respect to articles they shipped. I wish to offer another suggestion to lay alongside of the two. It is, I must admit, in support in some degree of what has been advanced by the hon. member for Edmonton. The question of a tribunal to which any traffic must be referred is after all simply a question of which tribunal is best. If it were possible, for any other class of damages, or any other class of difficulties, in regard to civil rights, or the regulation of the trade, to establish a tribunal other than the courts which would give better results than the courts, in my opinion the people engaged in that trade would have the right were the class large enough to that tribunal. The whole question amounts to this: is the class of cases of such extent, and do these cases involve such special matters of investigation and difficulty, that a special tribunal can best deal with them? It is well known that very many problems are now referred not to the courts but to commissioners. The province of Ontario now presents a most pronounced example in connection with the administration of a very large area of cases—cases in connection with workmen's compensation. They have relieved the courts entirely of the disposition of these cases and committed them without recourse to a workmen's compensation commission. The question as to whether in this case reference to a commission would be the better method I would think, would be this: is that commission in a better position than any court to dispose of questions of shortage and overage and to make regulations in the main governing the disposition of shortage and overage? Is it in a better position to do that? If it is, it appears to me that the question is settled. If it is able better to get at the evidence, if it is composed of men more familiar with the trade, if it is provided with the means of getting the evidence and doing substantial justice, to a greater degree than the courts, then, it appears to me, we have the answer to the problem, and such a tribunal should be clothed with the necessary powers. May I put it again? The question before us is not: are the people entitled to any better remedy than any other? They are entitled to the best they can get. If the Grain Commission is the best tribunal, then we should give them the Grain Commission. It appears to me that it is the best tribunal because it appears to me that in the long run likely more justice can be done than by recourse to the courts. The main reason is that in this matter of the regulation of the traffic in grain there might in the courts be great delay. Delay is exceptionally dangerous, and delay is inseparably incident to court procedure. It might be better that the usual rules of evidence should be departed from, and perhaps injury done in some cases, than that we should be compelled to resort to the protracted proceedings of the courts. I offer this only alongside of the views put forward by the hon. member for Edmonton.

Mr. BURNHAM: It seems to me that this discussion is founded upon what may be called the fallibility of the human race in regard to its own affairs. The various sufferings which people endure by reason of their incapacity are made up for as nearly as possible by what is known as a system of insurance. It is possible, therefore, where people cannot have recourse to law, or because the facts are such that they cannot be reasonably ascertained, to institute a system of insurance so that there will not really be any injustice done to any-

body, and this system might reasonably be extended to all Canada. Perhaps we could go a little further and extend it to every branch of that trade. We have had the same principle worked out after a great struggle during a long course of years in the Workmen's Compensation Act; let us have it also here. I do not think it is quite fair to say, as the hon. member for Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) has said, that we are spoon-feeding the West all the time and that we get no return. I must confess that I am a little frightened at the present time, considering that the farmers of Ontario, by reason of the decrease in the price of their farms through the competition of the West, have lost not less than $500,000,000 for the benefit of the West. But I wish to emphasize it, and I believe I am right when I say, that this difficulty could be overcome by means of the institution of an insurance policy. It seems to be quite reasonable and proper that the Government should institute it. They might possibly assess the shipper and the producer everywhere a very small amount for that purpose. There is no real reason why the state, which undertakes to control and administer the affairs of the people, should not provide in every particular for the efficient carrying out of the same.

To provide for the construction, acquisition, leasing or expropriation of terminal elevators, revote, $3,000,000.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to ask the minister if he would give the committee any explanation of the increase in the price of flour. The minister has described the care that is taken of the farmer's wheat from the time it leaves the wheat fields until it arrives at Port Arthur. After the grain has reached that point, what action, if any, does the Government take? Does the Government's action cease at Port Arthur and does the minister know why the price of flour has increased during the last few years? What happens after the wheat has reached Port Arthur and is put on board the boat there? Is there any other control exercised over the shipper, the carrier, the miller or the middleman before the flour finally gets to the consumer?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is somewhat cruel of my hon. friend, when my attention is centered on this great elevator and grain business, to call me back to a problem which we could discuss for a long, long while. I might at least give my hon. friend one reason why flour is higher to-day than it was two years ago: it is because the price of the grain out of which the flour is manufactured is a good deal higher than it was.

I remember that three years ago good merchantable wheat out of which good flour could be made, could be bought in the West at from 55 cents to 65 cents per bushel, but at present you cannot buy that same wheat for less than from $1.35 to $1.50 per bushel. The fundamental cause of the increase in price is the war and the conditions that have arisen from the war. I think you will find it true if you take all commercial transactions into account, that the moment there is one very predominating cause that makes for a rise in the price of an article, there is a tendency to give that a boost by everybody who has something to do with the handling of that article. I think myself that in the stores of Ottawa, Montreal and Toronto, we are paying to-day higher prices than are warranted by intrinsic conditions, simply because of the rise that has taken place in the staple commodities because of the war, and, in sympathy with that there is a tendency for everything to go a little higher. That is somewhat unphilosophical, but I think it may explain a little bit of the rise. The main reason is due to the fact that the material out of which flour is made has almost doubled in value, and there is beyond this a period when no man knows to what prices may go, and under such circumstances there is a tendency not to reduce prices, but to hold on and keep the prices up. I hope my hon. friend will excuse me for not going further into this.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister has expressed the view generally held and I am thankful to him. What supervision is exercised after the grain leaves Port Arthur?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is supervision in the eastern elevators to a certain extent. The grain having received its final certificate at Fort William, it carries this final certificate clear through to the point of shipment. I did say we might have more supervision over the weighing in and out through the eastern elevators along the Georgian bay and down to Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. GERMAN: Was the $4,700,000 voted last year all used?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. GERMAN: This is practically a revote of a portion of that money?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. GERMAN: Is it the intention of the minister to adopt the policy of taking over the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. GERMAN: Then, what terminal elevators are referred to in the vote?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We are taking over none, but there was power given to us in the Grain Act to expropriate, take over, or construct; and, while this vote is entirely for construction, we had to follow the wording of the Act in the vote. Nothing will be taken over so far as we have the least idea at the present time, but there is a transfer elevator to be built at Vancouver for the Pacific coast as a complement to the terminal elevator at Calgary, and there is also a terminal elevator to be built in due time at Hudson bay to act as a transfer for the Saskatoon and Moosejaw elevators, when the route to the Hudson bay is prepared to carry grain.

Mr. GERMAN: When will that be?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I could not say to within a week.

Department of Public Works—civil Government, $569,835.

Mr. ROGERS: In our civil government we have a clean bill of health; there are no increases except the ordinary statutory increases.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do I understand that Mr. Ewart, chief architect, has been superannuated?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who succeeds Mr. Ewart?

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Horwood.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has he been appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why?

Mr. ROGERS: We asked the Civil Service Commission to make the appointment, and in their judgment they did not think it was wise to do so. They gave it some consideration, I believe, but they did not approve of the appointment. We have to have a chief architect, and Mr. Horwood was the man who, in the judgment of the department, was the best available to take the position.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Am I to understand that Mr. Horwood has been taken on without the approval of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ROGERS: That is right.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is he not a technical officer?

Mr. ROGERS: The office of chief architect is really not a technical position; it is a position of great importance, and one that is entitled to consideration beyond the scope of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GERMAN: I had it in my mind that Mr. Ewart was to be retained as a consulting architect.

Mr. ROGERS: He is.

Mr. GERMAN: That is right; he is an excellent man.

Mr. PROULX: Does Mr. Horwood come from Winnipeg?

Mr. ROGERS: No, he comes from Ottawa.

Mr. PROULX: Is he the gentleman who designed the plans for the new Parliament buildings in Manitoba?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. PROULX: Is there not a Mr. Horwood in Winnipeg?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: Another gentleman?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF: What relation is Mr. Horwood of Ottawa to the architect in Winnipeg of the same name who, in connection with the foundation for the parliament buildings there, cancelled the written contract for $64,000 and afterwards put in other foundations that cost $778,000?

Mr. ROGERS: I am responsible for the figures which my hon. friend has quoted in regard to the buildings at Winnipeg, and I do not know anything about them. I have never seen any figures to show that the state of affairs is such as my hon. friend suggests. Mr. Horwood here is, I believe, a brother of Mr. Horwood in the city of Winnipeg. He is an architect of long standing in the city of Ottawa, and is well known here as an excellent architect.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there any correspondence between the department and the Civil Service Commission as to the appointment of Mr. Horwood?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, I believe there is.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend be kind enough to bring it down later on?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: What was the salary of Mr. Ewart, as chief architect?

Mr. ROGERS: $4,000.

Mr. PROULX: $3,000 is a large increase in these hard times.

Mr. ROGERS: It is impossible to get a man capable to fill the post of chief architect in the department at the present time unless such a salary is given. This salary was voted last year by this House for this purpose.

Mr. PROULX: What is the salary of the chief engineer of the Public Works Department?

Mr. ROGERS: It has been $4,000 up to date, but it should be increased; and if I can possibly do so, I hope to ask the House to increase it before we get through.

Mr. PROULX: The salary of the deputy minister is only $5,000, and he has more responsibility than the chief architect has.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the policy followed by the minister in regard to promotions in the inside service? Every time a member comes to Ottawa, he meets a large number of officials who complain that although they have been many years in the service, new men are brought in and promotions given right and left, and that they are overlooked unless they are recommended by some one in particular. When a man has reached the maximum of his class, what happens to him? Does he remain there for life, or is there any hope of promotion for him? What has to be done to get him into a higher class?

Mr. ROGERS: A man employed in the department makes application himself to the head of his particular branch, and that head reports the matter to the minister. His application is considered, and if approved it is transferred to the Civil Service Commission for consideration. If the Civil Service Commission approves, the promotion takes place.

Mr. MARCIL: There must be a vacancy in another branch, before he can be promoted to that branch?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: Did the minister ask for applications for the position of chief architect, or did he ask only this particular man to fill the position?

Mr. ROGERS: We had been looking for some months to get a man to take this position, before we decided upon Mr. Horwood.

Mr. PROULX: Did the Civil Service Commission advertise for a chief architect?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. PROULX: Why was not the appointment made through the Civil Service Commission? I understand that all the appointments in the different departments are filled through the Civil Service Commission; that is, a department asks the Civil Service Commission to recommend a man, and the commission advertises in the Canada Gazette and posts up advertisements in the different post offices throughout the country. The minister does not know whether or not he could have got a man for less than $7,000. If Mr. Ewart's salary was $4,000, there is an increase of $3,000, although the cost of living has not increased in that proportion. I find fault that in the different departments the ministers are too prone to pay very large salaries to the chief officials and to let the poor messengers starve on $500 a year. A messenger came to me the other day and said that he had been in the hospital. He had to go into the public ward; and when the bill was sent to the city, the city would not pay it, the city treasurer claiming that the Government should pay their men sufficient salaries to enable them to pay their hospital bills. This man said that his wife had been sick, and that he could not afford to call in a doctor. Rents are very high and the cost of living has increased. The minister goes on increasing the salaries of the higher officials from $5,000 to $6,000 or $7,000; in fact, the salary of the Deputy Minister of Justice was increased to $10,000; yet poor messengers who have families to support receive only $500 per year.

Mr. ROGERS: It is one of the weaknesses of the Civil Service Act that the minimum

salary to start with is $500 a year. We cannot pay more.

Mr. PROULX: The minister should be solicitous for those poor people, and not too solicitous for those who have high salaries.

Mr. ROGERS: I quite agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. PROULX: The minister might have been able to get a good architect for the salary that Mr. Ewart was receiving, or at least for $6,000 a year. It is an important position, and the minister should have asked for applications and not have selected only one particular man, because he happened to have connections in Winnipeg and to be a friend of my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: I suppose I will not be accused of being disposed with undue favour towards the members of the ministry or towards the Minister of Public Works; but it strikes me as hardly seemly that an officer of the department should be on the same basis as regards salary as the minister who is in charge of the department and whose responsibility must necessarily be very much greater. Either the minister should have more or the employee should have less. In the present time of stringency, it would appear that the alternative would be that in no case should an officer be at as high a salary as the minister. If a special technical employee must receive a high salary, surely the man who is responsible for the discharge by that official of his duty should in common sense receive proportionately more or at least enough to make a distinction between the two positions.

Mr. ROGERS: I quite agree with my hon. friend. Of course, the salaries of the ministers should be much higher than they are. At the same time, my hon. friend will understand it is impossible to get a chief architect or a chief engineer to-day who is not already in the department at any salary below the amount named. There is no respectable architect in business in any part of Canada that does not earn more than $7,000 in his own office. It would be impossible to get any architect suitable for the important position of chief architect of the Department of Public Works at any less salary than $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me there is great objection from another standpoint—that the minister has gone outside of his department to select a chief architect. For the proper encouragement of the men in the different departments, the principle of promotion should be acted upon. In the department, I know—I do not think I can possibly be mistaken—there are men, or were when I was minister, who are thoroughly qualified to take the position of chief architect. I have not a shadow of doubt about that. I think it is very objectionable to go outside and bring in a man and place him over the heads of those who have been for a long time in the department, and give him a greatly increased salary. This Government seems to be trying to break the Civil Service Act all to pieces, and I do not know of any more glaring case than the present. Take the chief engineer: he is well qualified to discharge his duty, and yet he receives a salary of only $4,000. That, I think, was fixed by the Civil Service Act by unanimous consent of this House. His duties are more onerous than those of the chief architect. They certainly require as great ability and as good judgment for their proper discharge. The chief engineer has been for a long time in the department, and, as I have said, he receives a salary of $4,000, in accordance with the terms of the Civil Service Act. Yet a new man is brought in and placed over the heads of all others, at a salary nearly double that which the chief engineer receives. It does seem to me that my hon. friend is making a great mistake in doing this. He is taking a step calculated to create discontent in the department, and is violating in the strongest way, not only the terms but the spirit of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. ROGERS: I agree with a great deal of what my hon. friend has said; but we had to deal with the case on practical considerations. The occasion for the appointment of the new chief architect was that Mr. Ewart asked to be relieved of the heavy responsibilities. The only other man that I know of who was in the department and who could have taken the place of Mr. Ewart as chief architect, was Mr. Wright. But Mr. Wright conceived the idea that he could do a much better business for himself outside the department, and resigned a short time before Mr. Ewart did. Had Mr. Wright still been in the department, he would undoubtedly have got the position of chief architect, because he is a really good man. But, after Mr. Wright, there was no one in the department who aspired to the position of chief.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What was Mr. Wrights salary when he resigned?

Mr. ROGERS: It was $3,800. He was a very good man; he had the material in him for a chief architect had he not resigned. It was necessary in the public interest to engage a good chief architect, and it is impossible—or was at that time—to secure one who would fill the position at less salary. This salary was approved by the House and voted last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The salary of $7,000 was not voted?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why is the vote of $3,000 in the Supplementary Estimates this year?

Mr. ROGERS: Because the chief architect was not appointed until six months ago. We had to put his name in the Estimates by reason of the fact that he has not passed the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It being in violation of the Civil Service Act, he has to be named?

Mr. KYTE: When the minister next has his Estimates before the committee he will be expected to give information with respect to the work that Mr. Gobeil, late Deputy Minister of Public Works, has been engaged in for the department.

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

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—PROGRESS REPORTED.

Bill No. 107, respecting a patent of John Millen & Son, Limited.—Mr. Webster.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 117, for the relief of Edith Marguerita Lyons.—Mr. Barnard.

SUPPLY.

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

Department of Public Works—contingencies, $85,000.

Mr. PROULX: The Minister of Public Works has stated that if Mr. Wright, assistant to Mr. Ewart, had not resigned, he would have promoted him. Did the minister give Mr. Wright to understand that he would be promoted upon Mr. Ewart's retirement? I believe that Mr. Wright resigned because he knew that he was not going to get the promotion.

Mr. ROGERS: I am quite satisfied that Mr. Wright did not resign because he knew that he was not going to get the promotion. If my memory serves me rightly, I discussed the matter with Mr. Wright. He had in view what appeared to be very bright prospects when he resigned to take up the position which he eventually did take up, and while the business has not succeeded as he expected it would, I understand that he is doing very well. I should be very glad to have Mr. Wright back in the department in any position that I could get him to fill.

Mr. PROULX: Did the minister hold before him the bright prospect of promotion?

Mr. ROGERS: Certainly I did.

Mr. PROULX: Was that before Mr. Ewart resigned?

Mr. ROGERS: No, after.

Mr. PROULX: How long was the position vacant?

Mr. ROGERS: It really was not vacant at all. Mr. Ewart expressed a desire to be relieved of his duties, but he did the work until it was possible for us to find some one to take his place.

Mr. PROULX: Was Mr. Wright offered the position then?

Mr. ROGERS: I cannot recall that definitely; I know that the matter was discussed with him.

Mr. KNOWLES: Did he ask for it?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. KNOWLES: Did he say he would take it if he got it?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not remember that; I think he was really anxious to take up this new work. Mr. Wright is a good man, and we would have been glad to have him in the department.

Mr. PROULX: I do not suppose Mr. Wright expected to get $7,000, even if he did get the position.

Mr. ROGERS: Well, he was worth it.

Public Works—Ottawa Archives building, extension, $50,000.

Mr. PROULX: Will this extension be built this year?

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend knows that we are not going on with any buildings

which it is possible to do without. Whether this particular building is a necessity this year or not, I am not in a position to say; if it proves to be a necessity, we will go on with it.

Mr. KYTE: On March 5, I asked the following questions of the Minister of Public Works:

1. When did A. Gobeil retire from the position of Deputy Minister of Public Works?
2. How long was he in that office?
3. What was the amount of his retiring allowance under the statute?
4. Is he employed by any department of the Government at the present time, and what is the nature of such employment?
5. What is the total amount he receives from the Government at the present time?

The following answers were given:

1. 1st July, 1908.
2. Appointed deputy minister on 1st January, 1891.
3. $2,160.
4. No.
5. $2,160.

I felt that there was something which the Minister of Public Works had not given out in his reply to these questions, so subsequently I addressed the following questions to him:

1. Was A. Gobeil, former Deputy Minister of Public Works, employed by any department of the Government since October 10, 1911?
2. If so, what was the nature of such employment?
3. What was the salary or remuneration paid him in respect of such employment?
4. When did such employment cease?

And this is the answer I got:

1. Yes, from 15th June, 1912.
2. To prepare a complete history of the port of Quebec, in relation to the St. Lawrence trade; to investigate titles of ownership of lands required in connection with St. Charles river improvements, and compile other information required by the department.
3. The difference between his superannuation allowance, $2,160, and $5,000, the salary of a deputy minister.
4. January 31, 1915.

These replies reveal a most extraordinary condition of affairs. Mr. Gobeil retired in 1908, after having discharged the duties of deputy minister since 1891. On the 15th of June his salary was restored to $5,000, the salary pertaining to the office of Deputy Minister. When I addressed the question to the Minister of Public Works on the 5th day of March, it anticipated by a few days the date upon which Mr. Gobeil's salary cheque for the month of February would have gone out; for I understand it is the rule in the departments—I am familiar at all events with the Department of Railways and Canals—that the salary cheques go out on the 10th of each month. When I asked the question of the minister on the 5th of March, the February cheque had not gone out, and would not have gone out for a few days in the ordinary course of events. Then Mr. Gobeil's employment with the Government suddenly terminated. The employment given to him was of an extremely indefinite character. According to the information given by the Minister of Public Works it would appear that on the 15th of June or some time previous Mr. Gobeil came to the department and saw the then Acting Minister of Public Works, and that as a result of their interview it was decided that Mr. Gobeil's salary would be restored to $5,000. Mr. Gobeil's services commenced on the 15th of June, 1912. Between that date and January 31, 1915, he has drawn, in addition to his superannuation allowance of $2,160, no less a sum than $7,457. I should like the Minister of Public Works to be good enough to say whether or not the work entrusted to Mr. Gobeil, as indicated by his reply to my question, is complete.

Mr. ROGERS: In answer to my hon. friend, I would say that what he states is correct. In view of the fact that Mr. Gobeil had such a general knowledge of the public works of this country, and in view of the necessity for an examination in connection with the contemplated work at the harbour of Quebec and in the St. Lawrence river, it was evidently thought by my predecessor in office that Mr. Gobeil would be a suitable person to make a report on the situation. He was therefore employed and he carried on the work with a great deal of vigour. On the 31st of January last we felt that the services he had rendered were such as to complete the work he had in hand, and he was therefore relieved of any further duties in connection with reporting on the matter of the development of the harbour at Quebec and St. Lawrence river. These are the facts as closely as I can carry them in my mind. It is true that Mr. Gobeil was employed for the time mentioned by my hon. friend, but, as I said, he is no longer an employee of the department.

Mr. KYTE: Has the minister a copy of this opus magnum to which Mr. Gobeil

has been devoting his time since the 15th of June, 1912?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not a copy here. I shall be glad to find out whether there is a copy in the department and let my hon. friend see it if he wishes.

Mr. KYTE: Has the book been published yet?

Mr. ROGERS: Not yet. It is a report, not a book.

Mr. KYTE: It says that he was employed to prepare a complete history of the port of Quebec. Has the copy reached the hands of the publishers yet?

Mr. ROGERS: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. KYTE: Who is to pay for publishing this work ?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know that it will be published at all. It will be simply a history of the port of Quebec, for the information of the department.

Mr. KYTE: Has the department the history yet?

Mr. ROGERS: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. KYTE: Then the department has nothing yet for this $7,457?

Mr. ROGERS: We have the benefit of all the information that Mr. Gobeil has in connection with that work. I understand the report is being prepared.

Mr. KYTE: The minister has not the benefit of all the knowledge Mr. Gobeil has, because he has not received the report yet. When does the minister expect to receive it?

Mr. ROGERS: Very shortly.

Mr. KYTE: Is this course being pursued with regard to the Harbour Commissioners in other parts of Canada?

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Gobeil had nothing at all to do with the Harbour Commissioners in the city of Quebec

Mr. KYTE: Has the Government undertaken the preparation of a history of any of the other harbours of Canada?

Mr. ROGERS: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. KYTE: So this special employment that was given to Mr. Gobeil was without a precedent?

Mr. ROGERS: The work was given to him by my predecessor because he was specially qualified for it. Mr. Gobeil had a very good knowledge of all such undertakings, and was well qualified to prepare such a report, and to give undoubtedly valuable information to the department and the country in respect to the great port of the city of Quebec.

Mr. KYTE: Is it intended that this work shall be distributed throughout Canada, or is it just for the benefit of the department?

Mr. ROGERS: Wherever there is a necessity for it.

Mr. KYTE: What were the terms upon which Mr. Gobeil was employed?

Mr. ROGERS: All the information the department has is in the answer given to my hon. friend's question.

Mr. KYTE: Well, the department has not very much information. It is rather an extraordinary coincidence that when Mr. Gobeil was employed to do this work there was no remuneration fixed except that he was to enjoy a salary, in addition to his superannuation allowance, which would bring his income up to the sum of $5,000. It is perfectly clear from the statement made by the minister that there was no agreement or contract under which any special work was to be done, but that Mr. Gobeil was for all time, so far as the present Government is concerned, to get around the Superannuation Act and enjoy the salary of $5,000 just as if he were a deputy minister. The minister says that on January 31, Mr. Gobeil's work having been completed, his services were discontinued. Now the minister does not know whether his work has been completed or not, because he has not a copy of the manuscript that Mr. Gobeil prepared, if he prepared anything at all. I should think that if Mr. Gobeil had any legitimate or proper employment it should not cease until his work was in the hands of the minister, and the minister would be able to pass upon the question whether that work fairly represented the amount of money that was paid. I am bound to say that the sum of $7,457 is a pretty tidy sum to be paid to Mr. Gobeil in addition to his superannuation allowance for the preparation of a history of the port of Quebec. If the question had not been put upon the Order Paper I venture to say that Mr. Gobeil would still be enjoying the emoluments pertaining to the employment given to him by the late Minister of Public Works. The fact that this employ-

ment was given to him by the late minister does not exonerate the present minister from some responsibility. I say that under the circumstances there is no justification for this expenditure of money. The minister admits himself that he knows nothing about the work or the manner in which it was carried on, and he does not know at the present moment whether the work has been completed. I stated before that it was only after my question had been placed on the order paper that Mr. Gobeil's employment terminated. If I had not put the question when I did the presumption is that Mr. Gobeil would have continued to enjoy the emoluments pertaining to the particular employment in which he was engaged.

It is a significant fact that no special compensation was allowed to Mr. Gobeil, but he was to get such a sum as would make up the difference between his superannuation allowance of $2,160 and $5,000. This is only another way of getting around the Superannuation Act by which a friend of the Government was able to draw from the treasury of this country the sum of $7,457 for services of the value of which to the Department of Public Works there is no evidence.

Mr. PARDEE: What was really the object of this gentleman going down there and writing the history of the port of Quebec? Is the information not really contained in other histories? How has the Government or the country been able to benefit from a history of the port of Quebec? Was it to help to promote any trade interest or development? Along what line was it necessary that this man should be sent down to do such a thing as that? Was it absolutely necessary to write a history of the port of Quebec to promote any material interest in connection with that port?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the report published?

Mr. ROGERS: No; we have not received it yet. I might say in answer to my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) that the port of Quebec is an especially important port and one that requires a great deal of consideration at the hands of the Government. My predecessor, Mr. Monk, was very wise indeed in employing the services of one so capable to deal with the work of research which Mr. Gobeil undertook to do in connection with the port of Quebec. It was contemplated at that time, as is evidenced from the amount of money that has been spent during the past three years, that great development should take place in that particular port. It was undoubtedly advisable in the public interest that we should have all the information for our use which it was possible to obtain and which we have had both by personal correspondence and conversation with Mr. Gobeil from that time on. Now that he has succeeded in gathering all the information at that port, he is no longer in the employ of the department and his report is expected daily. When it comes I am sure that the report will be of great value and great interest not only to the people of Quebec but to the people in different parts of Canada generally who take an interest in the development of our national ports. There are few, if any, ports that are more important than the port of Quebec, especially in view of the fact that we are about to establish a large dry dock in that port, that large docks are to be constructed and that the harbour commissioners are about to expend large sums of money in the erection of an elevator and other important works. In view of these things it was in the public interest that my predecessor should get the best information and with that object in view he evidently employed Mr. Gobeil.

Mr. PARDEE: I do not understand just what the minister means by his statement in answer to my question. The port of Quebec is to be an important port, a dry dock is to be established, elevators are to be built, many other things are to be done, but the mill does not grind with the water that has gone through. To me, an ordinary onlooker, it would certainly seem unnecessary that Mr. Gobeil should go to Quebec and report on what the port of Quebec was one hundred years ago. It would not help to build elevators or dry docks or show what ought to be done in the future. I quite sympathize with the minister in doing the best he can for his predecessor, but I believe that if he looks this matter squarely in the face, as he and I, ordinary business men, would, he will agree with me when I say that we would not waste more than a couple of hours in reading about what the port of Quebec was a hundred years ago, for the purpose of helping us to do something in connection with that port to-day. I am still at a loss to understand why Mr. Monk should have sent Mr. Gobeil down to make a report on the history of Quebec. Take the very important and flourishing port of Sarnia; we might have a history of that port written for the last hundred years, and possibly if we were real good, and wrote and published

the history of Sarnia, we might have elevators, a drydock and other things there. I doubt very much if the minister would accede to a request to send a man to write a history of the port of Sarnia. In all seriousness, I quite appreciate what the minister has said, but again I ask, wherein do the people of Canada benefit by the fact that he has got an unpublished history of Quebec for the past seventy or eighty years.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend uses the word "history" of Quebec. That may be the term that was used in some of the correspondence, and he may be correct from that point of view, but, as I understand Mr. Gobeil's appointment, it was in connection with the practical work about to be undertaken in that port. The unhappy phrase "history" of Quebec might have been used, but it was not intended that he should write a history of Quebec in the ordinary sense of that word.

Mr. PROULX: Has not the harbour commission of the port of Quebec an engineer to look after its work?

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Gobeil was appointed before the harbour commissioners were appointed.

Mr. PROULX: Is there an engineer in the employ of the harbour commission?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it a fact that Sir William Price, chairman of the harbour commission, has resigned?

Mr. ROGERS: We were so informed to-day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the resignation of Sir William Price been accepted by the ministers?

Mr. ROGERS: It has not been accepted yet.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to ask the minister if Mr. Gobeil has not been employed also in making valuations of land on the St. Charles river in connection with the locks to be constructed at the mouth of that river? Is there a report in the hands of the hon. gentleman as regards the cost of the locks, and also the cost of the expropriation in connection with the riparian rights?

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend is quite right, and I overlooked the point in referring to the matter that Mr. Gobeil had made reports to the department in connection with the proposed works now under way on the St. Charles. We have these reports, and I will be glad to bring them down to the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the approximate cost of the proposed expropriations on the St. Charles river, as reported on by Mr. Gobeil?

Mr. ROGERS: As far as my memory serves me, the value placed by Mr. Gobeil upon the land to be expropriated is something like $600,000. The price at which the land was valued was 23 cents a foot, and the value of another portion was fixed at a higher figure than that. The smaller portion, which was at the higher price, we refused to accept, but last year the owners came down to the price of 23 cents for the piece at the higher valuation, and we accepted it.

As I understand it, the owners are now prepared to accept the twenty-three cents, but as the result of a further valuation we think our previous offer was too high, and it will likely go to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish the minister would submit to us at the next sitting of the House, a copy of Mr. Gobeil's report on the expropriation of those riparian lands on the river St. Charles, and also a copy of the plan showing where the expropriations will take place.

Mr. ROGERS: We have such a plan and report and I shall bring it down.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will Mr. Gobeil receive any remuneration for the work to which my hon. friend has referred?

Mr. ROGERS: No, that was part of the work to be done for his salary.

Mr. KYTE: Has the minister correspondence with Mr. Gobeil, defining the work he is to do for this salary and giving the terms of his engagement?

Mr. ROGERS: My deputy informs me that there is simply a letter written in 1912 from the chief engineer to Mr. Gobeil.

Mr. KYTE: Will the minister bring that down?

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. KYTE: How does the minister explain that Mr. Gobeil's remuneration was fixed at the difference between $2,140 and $5,000? Is that the usual terms upon which legal or other services are engaged by the department?

Mr. ROGERS: The remuneration was fixed at the sum which the then minister

thought fair and reasonable. The Superannuation Act provides for a man being brought back at the same salary he had previously received, and probably that was in the mind of the minister when he fixed the sum at $5,000.

Mr. KYTE: Is there anything in the correspondence to indicate when Mr. Gobeil's work was to be finished, or was it to be a continuous engagement during the life of Mr. Gobeil?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not read the correspondence, but I will bring it down and the hon. member can read it. Mr. Gobeil is not in the service of the Government at the present time.

Mr. KYTE: I understand that, but it might be well for the minister himself to read the correspondence.

The CHAIRMAN: Personally I have no objection to this discussion continuing, but it is out of order as not pertaining to the item under discussion.

Mr. KYTE: I understood that all expenditures in the Public Works Department might be discussed now.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is the desire of the committee, I have no objection, but the rule is that the discussion must be strictly relevant to the item before the House.

Mr. ROGERS: It is quite all right; I shall be very glad to give any information to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend has stated that Sir William Price has resigned what are the reasons given by Sir William Price for his resignation.

Mr. ROGERS: Sir William Price is in no way connected with the Public Works Department; his duties are under the Department of Marine, and I am sure the minister will be pleased to give the information.

Mr. HAZEN: The only reason why Sir William Price handed in his resignation is, that he being a man with large interests finds it difficult to give to the discharge of the duties of his office the time and attention required. The relations of the Department of Marine and Fisheries with Sir William Price and the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec have been of the most agreeable and pleasant character.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: I may say that I regret, as the minister regrets, and as everybody does, the resignation of Sir William Price.

Mr. PROULX: It took Mr. Gobeil a long time to write his report on the Quebec harbour; was his time exclusively given to the work?

Mr. ROGERS: I am informed that he had no other employment and that he devoted all his time to the work.

Mr. PROULX: Mr. Gobeil is an advocate, practising his profession, and it may be that he did not give his whole time to the work of the department. I do not hold the present minister responsible, because he says his predecessor requested him to employ Mr. Gobeil, but although my hon. friend has tried to cover the matter as cleverly as possible, I believe that Mr. Gobeil, having been the Conservative candidate in Montmorency in 1908, this job was given to him as a reward, and the people of the country have to pay for it.

Mr. KYTE: Has the minister any communication from Mr. Gobeil stating that the work is completed?

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Gobeil has been sending in reports in connection with the different works at the port of Quebec, such as the special work we are doing in connection with the development of the St. Charles river, which is a very large, a very necessary, and a very important work. These reports will be brought down to the House.

Mr. KNOWLES: I suppose the minister will get these reports printed and send each member of the House a complimentary copy?

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. KNOWLES: What was the salary paid Mr. Ewart, the former chief architect?

Mr. ROGERS: $4,000.

Mr. KNOWLES: When was the salary raised to $7,000 per annum?

Mr. ROGERS: When Mr. Ewart decided he desired to be relieved from the responsible duties of chief architect, which were growing from year to year, and a new architect had to be secured.

Mr. KNOWLES: How long has the new architect been appointed?

Mr. ROGERS: About six months.

Mr. KNOWLES: If we voted only $4,000 for the salary last year, how has he been paid $7,000? Has Mr. Horwood been paid?

Mr. ROGERS: He cannot be paid until this vote is passed.

Mr. KNOWLES: Why cannot he be paid like any otner person who is appointed to office?

Mr. ROGERS: Because his name has to be put in the Estimates.

Mr. KNOWLES: Why?

Mr. ROGERS: Because he has not a certificate from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. KNOWLES: Has the minister asked the Civil Service Commissioners or either of them to o.k. Mr. Horwood?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: What did they say?

Mr. ROGERS: They refused to do it.

Mr. KNOWLES: Was there much correspondence about it?

Mr. ROGERS: Some.

Mr. KNOWLES: Was it not on account of that that the minister expressed such virtuous indignation against Mr. Shortt?

Mr. ROGERS: I can assure my hon. friend it was not; I never thought of it.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister tell me why he was so angry?

Mr. ROGERS: I told the House before, while the hon. member was absent.

Mr. KNOWLES: I read the report in Hansard very carefully, and I could not see any reasonable explanation for such indignation.

Mr. ROGERS: The matter was discussed quite shortly.

Mr. KNOWLES: You are a little short on explanation.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is no doubt that the development of the port of Quebec is important, and that the harbour of Quebec historically is well known in Canada as being one of the most magnificent ports in this great country of ours. The peculiarity about this report is that to the ordinary man it is a question of engineering, such a report as the minister would get from an engineer. There is some dredging to be done, and it is a question of measurements, of estimating how much earth is to be removed and what concrete and supports will be necessary for the piers that are to be constructed at the port. We have a very excellent development of that kind going on in the harbour of Halifax and in the harbour of St. John, but I am not aware that any lawyer has to be engaged to write a history of the harbour of Halifax or of the harbour of St John. I want to bring this matter to the notice of the ministers generally that, while we have very excellent men in the different departments—and I would be sorry to think that we have not good officials capable of discharging the various duties devolving upon them and of furnishing any information that the different departments require—whenever any thing special is to be done under this Administration an outsider must be obtained. In some inquiries that are going on not one thousand miles from this place, it has developed that when anything has to be bought, or anything to be done or any information to be secured, an outsider has always to be secured, and that there is no one in the departments capable of doing the work. That is a sad state of affairs, if it is true. I do not believe it is true; I believe we have capable officials, and I must bring the blame home to the minister and his brother ministers that this policy is adopted only for the purpose of giving employment to their friends outside. The officials of the different departments are there for the purpose of doing the work pertaining to those departments; but the ministers, in order to widen their sphere of employment, when it is a question of buying binoculars or truck wagons, must employ men of large salary and high education, in the legal profession particularly, to do that kind of work. I would be sorry to say a word that would reflect anything but the highest credit upon Mr. Gobeil. I knew him well; he was in the Department of Public Works when I came here first, and a better officer I never came across. He is a good lawyer, and I could understand his being employed by the Minister of Public Works to secure a law library for his department or to write a treatise on titles for land in the province of Quebec—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Or the McGreevy case.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps it was because he knew too much about the McGreevy case that he was employed; but

to employ a lawyer like himself to make an engineering report is something that I do not quite understand.

Mr. ROGERS: Although I think my hon. friend has answered himself, I may say that in so far as Mr. Gobeil's standing as a lawyer is concerned, he has never practised his profession at all. He was in the Department of Public Works for over thirty years; he was for ten or twelve years secretary of the department, and he was for seventeen years Deputy Minister of Public Works. Therefore, Mr. Gobeil was the man in Canada who would be most likely to have a proper knowledge where special work was required and who would be capable of making a report or of giving information to the department that would be valuable and sound, in view of his long and thorough understanding of the conditions and of the manner in which the department carried on its business. As I understand it, he has made very valuable reports in connection with the different works at Quebec; and, while I have not time to read them, I will see that they are all brought down and laid on the table of the House, so that hon. gentlemen who are interested will have an opportunity of reading them.

Ottawa Parliament Buildings — additions, $100,000.

Mr. PARDEE: What is that?

Mr. ROGERS: That is an addition to this building. This vote is the same one as we had last year, but we did not go on with the work.

Mr. McCRANEY: Are those votes included in the sum of $50,000,000 for special expenditure other than the war, mentioned in the Budget speech of the Minister of Finance?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. McCRANEY: The minister has not thought it desirable to drop some of the items for the present year so that the amount necessary to be realised may be reduced?

Mr. ROGERS: When the Estimates were prepared this year, we dropped a number of items as they were printed last year. We have included in the Estimates only such items as we are hopeful, if the war should cease and conditions improve, we shall be able to go on with.

Mr. PROULX: I find in the Auditor General's Report that a quantity of furniture has been purchased by the Department of Public Works for the different offices in the public buildings. Since the Government came into power, what have they done with the furniture that was there when they came in? $900 was spent to furnish the office of the Minister of Justice, and about $800 to furnish the office of the Secretary of State. There must have been some furniture there when the present Government came in.

Mr. HENDERSON: Goodness knows; perhaps it was all gone.

Mr. PROULX: What was done with it? Was it thrown out or was it given to my hon. friend's friends?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. PROULX: The Department of Public Works bought a rug for the Secretary of State's office valued at $350.

Mr. ROGERS: It must be a mistake.

Mr. HENDERSON: How big was it?

Mr. PROULX: I do not know. I would like to see that rug. There was purchased from Murray-Kay, Limited, three rugs, one at $385. I said $350; I undervalued it. There is a rug at $85, and another at $49.50. I would like to know the size of that rug valued at $385?

Mr. KYTE: Was it made in Canada?

Mr. PROULX: I do not know whether there is as expensive a rug in Windsor Palace. In the Justice Department there is an item for furniture for the minister's room, $805.

Mr. HENDERSON: No justice about that.

Mr. PROULX: There is a bookcase, $54; three chairs, $78.50; clock, $10; davenport, $63; covering davenport with leather, $35; desk, $135. You can buy a good desk for $50—in fact, for $25. I bought one the other day from the Office Specialty Company, for the office of the school inspector of my county, and I paid only $25.

Mr. ROGERS: Was it delivered for that?

Mr. PROULX: The freight from their establishment in Newmarket cost only about a dollar. But this $135 is not all. There is a glass desk-top, $32.85. And the furniture for the minister's room cost $805—two leather chairs, $16.50; three mahogany dinners, $38.85. Does the minister give dinners in his office? For a waste-paper basket we paid $9—you can get one any-

where for half a dollar. When the Liberals were in power we heard about the middleman. But turn to the Auditor General's Report and you will see that under this Government articles to furnish the departments are not bought directly from the manufacturers but from the middlemen. The Government could save 25 per cent or 30 per cent if they dealt with the wholesale men or manufacturers. If it were not that I dislike to take up the time of the committee, I could go through the record of these departments and show that thousands and thousands of dollars have been spent on furniture since this Government come into office. Surely the old furniture was all right. When the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Pugsley) was Minister of Public Works, if a colleague of his had had come and asked him to pay $385 for a rug, I think he would have thought that colleague was out of his mind. We see now the greatest extravagance that has ever reigned under any Government in this country. Fortunately the Government will have to render an account to the people very soon, and I shall be very much surprised if the voters do not hold them to a very strict account. I can well understand why my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), when he spoke on the Budget said this Government is spending the money of the people like a lot of drunken sailors. I have been struck with the truth of that expression since I commenced to look into the Auditor General's Report. On reading these figures I was astounded and disgusted at the extravagance they reveal.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sorry that my hon. friend has been so shocked, astounded and pained. I do not know that a fair examination of the accounts will show that the furniture for the Department of Justice or the Department of the Secretary of State was too expensive. The furniture from those offices, no doubt, was used in other offices in the different buildings. That is always the practice; furniture that is old and worn to some extent in the offices of the ministers is removed, and is cleaned up and placed in some other offices with a view to saving as much as we possibly can on this item of furniture.

Mr. PROULX: But I cannot see where they put all the furniture. They have not been opening so many offices as that. Go through the Auditor General's Report for 1914, and you will see the record
9 p.m. of the purchase of many, many articles—desks, chairs, couches; they seem to have a great liking for couches; apparently they have a great disposition to sleep. Even, they have "diners." Do they get their meals brought to their offices? I do not suppose that they are so busy that they could not go to a boarding-house.

Mr. KNOWLES: What does the term "dinners" mean?

Mr. ROGERS: I could not tell my hon. friend. It must be a clerical error.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister get the information?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: The Minister of Public Works seems more saving for himself than for his colleagues.

Mr. ROGERS: Thank you.

Mr. KNOWLES: He does not sleep.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Perhaps he is not in his office.

Mr. PROULX: The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) has been more saving than the Secretary of State (Mr. Coderre), but I find that in his case the Office Specialty Manufacturing Company sold quite a number of articles for a total of $581.50—mostly office furniture.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How about couches?

Mr. PROULX: I do not find any couches. He does not seem disposed to sleep.

Public Buildings—Ottawa Victoria Memorial Museum, $200,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that for the tower?

Mr. ROGERS: Hon. gentlemen are familiar with the conditions there: the foundation has been sinking and it is necessary to support it. We have a report from Mr. Monserrat, a copy of which, I believe, has been laid on the table. It is necessary that this work should be taken up immediately, and it is estimated that it will cost $200,000. That is why the estimate is increased to this amount.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it intended to take the tower over?

Mr. ROGERS: No, they think they can get along without that. The tower is rather breaking away from the main building. It is suggested by some that it is dangerous,

but Mr. Monserrat thinks there is no immediate danger, and that if the work is undertaken this summer it will be all right.

Public Buildings—Toronto—new Dominion buildings, $225,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is this for the new customs house?

Mr. ROGERS: No, for the general post office.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What will you do with the old building?

Mr. ROGERS: It is to be removed.

Mr. KNOWLES: Are the plans prepared for this Toronto building?

Mr. ROGERS: Only sketch plans.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is there any estimate of final cost?

Mr. ROGERS: Not yet.

Mr. KNOWLES: I think that before we are called upon to pass the preliminary vote we should have some idea of what the Government has in mind. It is hardly right to vote a hundred thousand and not know how many millions we shall have to spend before we stop.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think it will be necessary to go to the millions.

Mr. KNOWLES: But the principle still holds. Before the Government asks us to launch out on a contract, they ought to give us at least some rough estimate of the expenditure that will be involved.

Mr. ROGERS: We are not yet in possession of information that I could give my hon. friend; pending the receipt of reports from the architect and from others in charge of the work, we do not know exactly what the cost will be. We are only going to put up such a building as will meet the requirements of the public interest. I do not think the cost will be more than a million dollars.

Mr. PROULX: I observe that the Government supply the residences of deputy ministers, secretaries and other officers of the various departments with free telephone service. Is it customary to pay for telephones at the residences of these officials?

Mr. ROGERS: It has always been the practice.

Mr. PROULX: On what principle does the Government pay for these telephones?

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. ROGERS: On the principle that the deputy ministers find it necessary and in the public interest to have telephones at their residences, to be used in connection with their departmental work. It was thought a good many years ago that this would be an advisable extension of the departmental telephone service, and the same practice is carried on to-day.

Mr. PROULX: There might be occasion for a telephone at the residence of a deputy minister, but the other officers of the department are employed only during the day, and I do not see why their telephones should be paid for.

Harbours and rivers—Esquimalt dry dock, $250,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What has been done in connection with this work?

Mr. ROGERS: We have purchased a site alongside the old dock at Lang's cove. The plans are not yet complete, but when they are ready they will be transmitted to the Admiralty for approval. Only $250,000, therefore, is put in at present for this proposed work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the size of the proposed dry dock?

Mr. ROGERS: 1,150 feet by 110 feet. The plan of the dock at Quebec is followed as closely as possible.

French river waterway improvements, $500,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it proposed to go ahead with this work during the present year?

Mr. ROGERS: This is one of the works that may well, I think, stand for the present year. It is not the intention to press it this year.

Mr. McCRANEY: I understand that the Minister of Finance looks forward to an expenditure in the neighbourhood of $50,000,000 on capital account for public buildings and that sort of thing. If I understood the Finance Minister's Budget aright, he expects to raise $30,000,000; about $10,000,000 from the special taxation and about $20,000,000 from the increased duties. If the whole sum of $50,000,000 were expended, the $30,000,000 which I have mentioned would be entirely exhausted, and it would be necessary to borrow besides another $20,000,000. The Minister of Public Works has certain items in the Estimates, the works connected with which he does not intend to proceed with this year. Has

the minister made any estimate as to the amount of these items?

Mr. ROGERS: We have not made any such statement as my hon. friend suggests. Our whole estimate of expenditure, including capital account, is only $32,000,000.

Port Arthur and Fort William harbour and river improvements, $1,500,000.

Mr. OLIVER: How much has been spent on harbour improvements at Port Arthur and Fort William?

Mr. ROGERS: The total expenditure up to March last was $8,500,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is the harbour owned altogether by the Government?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, entirely.

Mr. DEVLIN: With reference to the French river waterway improvements, why is it that the whole of the amount voted last year was not expended?

Mr. ROGERS: We were only able to proceed with the dam at Chaudière last year.

Mr. DEVLIN: I understood that the vote was for the construction of the Georgian Bay canal.

Mr. ROGERS: To some extent that was the purpose of the vote. Practically my hon. friend is right, but all the work we were able to do was the dam.

Public Works—Quebec harbour—dry-dock at Lauzon, $700,000.

Mr. MARCIL: When will this dock be ready?

Mr. ROGERS: We did hope that it would be ready this summer. We are now pressing the contractor to get it ready by this fall.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the excavation work been started?

Mr. ROGERS: It is well under way.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the old dry-dock in use at present?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Public Works—Quebec harbour—deep water wharf at Lévis, $34,200.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that work under way?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. This is to finish it.

Public Works—Quebec harbour—improvements, $500,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What work is going on under this vote?

Mr. ROGERS: This is for the wharf that was proposed near Champlain Market. The item was originally in the Railway Estimates as part of the Transcontinental scheme, but it has been transferred to the Public Works Department. The railway part of the scheme has been completed, and we are asking for the money because the wharf is considered necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it intended to go on with that work?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think we shall do much at it this year, but with the money we shall be in a position to go on with the contract if necessary.

Mr. MARCIL: Has any contract been awarded for this work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. The contract was awarded a few years ago by the late Govenment.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the work been proceeding all this time?

Mr. ROGERS: The contract included the construction of a wharf, and the building of a railway from where the railway crosses the river. Some diversion was made in the contract with the result that the railway end of it was carried out, but not the dock end of it. This item is to enable us to go on with the wharf if necessary.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the name of the contractor?

Mr. ROGERS: Davis had the contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If I remember rightly it was intended to erect the terminal of the Transcontinental at the Champlain market, but after a consultation with the engineers we thought that would be a very desirable place for piers for some of the ocean steamers. That is why that amount was provided at that time. I suppose that the changing of the site of the terminal station has modified the views of the Government as to where the improvements should be made?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Public Works—Quebec harbour—River St. Charles—improvements to navigation, $500,000.

Mr. KYTE: I would ask the minister to let this item stand until we get the information in regard to Mr. Gobeil's report.

Mr. ROGERS: All right.

Item stands.

Public Works—St. John harbour, N.B.—improvements, $1,500,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister state how the $3,000,000 that was spent last year was divided? What portion was spent on dredging on the west side, how many cubic yards of dredging were done, what was the price per cubic yard, what amount of wharf building was done, what was the cost of the temporary warehouses, and how much was spent on the breakwater and on dredging in Courtenay bay?

Mr. ROGERS: I have the reports of the officers of the department here, but they are very lengthy. I shall be glad to send them over to my hon. friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps the minister would hand it to Hansard.

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Had Michael Connolly the contract for any of this work at St. John?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, for the wharves on the west side.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the amount of the contract?

Mr. ROGERS: Something like $1,250,000. The contract was afterwards transferred to the Maritime Dredging Company, who were able to complete the contract in time, and, I think, to the satisfaction of the people of St. John.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the reason for transferring the contract, and how much did Mr. Connolly get for the work he did?

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Connolly received $605,000 for the portion of the work he did. The department thought he was not likely to complete the contract in time, and so it was handed over to the Maritime Dredging Company, as they were able to carry on the work more speedily.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does Mr. Connolly claim any extra payment?

Mr. ROGERS: No, he was quite satisfied, I think.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think that after the contract was given to the Maritime Dredging Company a change was made in the specifications to permit of substitution of southern timber for Canadian timber, and also change as to the mode in which the crib should be built. I should like to ask whether that is correct, and whether the new contractors were permitted to substitute a good deal of dredging material in place of rock. I understand that that was permitted.

Mr. ROGERS: A change was made in the specifications in regard to timber in order to get the work completed within the time limit. It meant an additional cost of something like $40,000. As to filling, dredged material was used for back filling.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am told that dredged material was used for filling in the cribs.

Mr. ROGERS: No, for back filling only.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What was the cost of the warehouses?

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the cost of the temporary warehouse?

Mr. HAZEN: The engineer tells me that the whole cost of the warehouse is $27,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to ask the minister if the work performed by Mr. Michael Connolly was accepted by the department as satisfactory? I understand that it was only the question of the delay which caused the transference of the work from Mr. Connolly to the Maritime Dredging Company. I understand that Mr. Connolly is a good contractor.

Mr. ROGERS: The principal difficulty was that Mr. Connolly was not proceeding with the work as rapidly as it was thought it should be proceeded with. There was great pressure for the earliest possible completion of this dock in the city of St. John. We were bound to have it completed last fall before the business started and, owing to the reports of the engineers who were sent to examine it, we thought it was going to be impossible, at the rate at which he was carrying on the work, to have it completed in time. That was the reason it was taken from him.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In order to enable the new contractors to hasten the work and finish it in the required time they were allowed, at an extra cost to the department, to substitute southern timber for Canadian timber. Was such a proposal as that ever made to Mr. Connolly to enable him to hurry on the work?

Mr. ROGERS: It was impossible to get the local timber in any case and Mr. Connolly would have had that same right if he had been able to go on and complete the work

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was there any proposal to that effect ever made to Mr. Connolly?

Mr. ROGERS: The chief engineer says that before we reached that point it had been taken out of Mr. Connolly's hands because he was not getting on as fast as he should have.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not the minister see that Mr. Connolly was treated unjustly, because, according to the minister's own statement, it was impossible to get the matter settled in time to get the timber which was required by the specifications? Without suggesting to Mr. Connolly that he would be allowed to use southern pine, the contract was taken out of his hands because he was not proceeding with sufficient rapidity and it was given to the Maritime Dredging Company and, concurrently with that, the class of timber to be used was changed and they were allowed $40,000 more than Mr. Connolly was to get. Does the minister not think that was something of an injustice to Mr. Connolly?

Mr. ROGERS: The position was simply this, that we had repeatedly impressed upon Mr. Connolly the necessity of making more rapid progress than he was making with this contract and when the engineers reported that there was no chance of him having it completed in the time prescribed by the contract, an arrangement was made with him by which his work was taken over. He had arranged with others for a local timber but it was discovered that it was utterly impossible to get delivery of the timber and it was absolutely necessary on the part of the new contractor to go on and get the timber in order to have the work completed in time for last year's business. It was a matter that was entirely beyond the control of the department. We could not do anything else to have the work completed and if we had not secured this timber the contract would not have been completed in time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was not Mr. Connolly doing the very best possible to get the timber required by the specifications when the contract was taken out of his hands?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know; he may have been doing that, but he was not getting on with the work as fast as the department thought he should.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What happened? It was taken out of his hands, given to new contractors, and they were at once told that they need not carry out the specifications, that they could get timber different from that which Mr. Connolly was obliged to get. When they got the timber that they could get more easily than the timber required by the specifications, the department allowed the new contractors an extra sum of $40,000. They allowed him to get timber which it was easier to get, and they paid him $40,000 more.

Mr. ROGERS: That was not exactly the case. The representations which prompted the department to make the change in the timber came from the city of St. John itself. The city of St. John pressed this upon the Government. Understanding the local conditions, they brought to the attention of the department the fact that the only hope of having the contract completed was by getting the class of timber that we did get in order to carry on the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have understood that Mr. Connolly's complaint—and he makes a very strong complaint—is that he was not given the same chance as the new contractors were given. If he had been allowed to substitute southern timber he could have got along just as rapidly as the new contractors did. However, I suppose the minister has said all he can upon it. I would like to ask as to the depth of the dredging which has been done upon the west side.

Mr. ROGERS: Thirty-two feet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And for the crib site?

Mr. ROGERS: Thirty-five feet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has there been no dredging done outside of the crib site to thirty-five feet?

Mr. ROGERS: The engineer says that he has no knowledge of such.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would like to mention this fact for the minister's information: Other gentlemen were formerly interested in the Maritime Dredging Company who were the previous contractors. They conferred with me about going to a depth of thirty-five feet. I thought that, not only for the crib site but for the basin, it was desirable to dredge to a depth of thirty-five feet, and I so authorized the engineer, Mr. Scammell. I expected to have an Order in Council passed giving authority for this work. I understand that the dredging to a depth of thirty-five feet was done, but it has not been paid for by reason of it being alleged that the company went below depth.

My own view is that as there is considerable silting in the harbour it would be desirable to go to a sufficient depth to avoid the necessity of dredging again in the near future. Has the minister's attention been called to that claim?

Mr. ROGERS: I have no recollection of ever having had my attention called to that particular matter. I quite appreciate what my hon. friend says in regard to the matter of silting in the harbour of St. John, and in my judgment care should be taken to see that the depth should be great enough. At all events, I shall be very glad to look into the matter that the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. HAZEN: Has any claim been put in?

Mr. PUGSLEY: There has been a claim put in. Mr. James A. Bulyea was in Ottawa and saw me in reference to the matter.

Mr. HAZEN: He did not see me. I have never heard anything about any claim being made.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He was here for some days and endeavoured to get the matter settled.

Mr. HAZEN: I never saw him.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought he would have seen the minister.

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be very glad to look into it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am pleased to hear the minister say that. I feel a certain amount of responsibility in connection with it, for the reason that perhaps I ought to have expedited it before the late Government went out of office and had the Order in Council passed. Mr. Scammell held the opinion that it was very desirable to dredge to that depth in the basin. Has it been arranged that the drydock should be of the same dimensions as those which will be built at Quebec and Esquimalt?

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend is familiar with the original conditions under which a dry dock of 900 feet was proposed, but the department suggested a dry dock of 1,150 feet similar to those at Halifax and Quebec. This has been brought to the attention of the Norton Griffiths Company, the contractors, but they have not yet signified their willingness to carry it out. The matter is now under consideration, and I believe will be adjusted. I am free to acknowledge that undoubtedly the port of St. John ought to have and must have a dry dock of similar size to those at Halifax and Quebec.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am very glad indeed to hear the statement of the minister, because I think it would be desirable to build a dry dock of 1,150 feet at St. John, not merely that it may be as large as those at Quebec and Esquimalt and Halifax, but because of the convenience of dividing it into sections so that vessels of different sizes can be taken care of to advantage. A great deal of shipping comes to the port of St. John, and the business is increasing every year. I think the minister will make no mistake if he arranges for a dry dock of a larger size.

Mr. ROGERS: My idea was that I did not regard it as fair that the port of St. John should have a smaller dry dock than that in Quebec or in Halifax, because I felt that ships which require the largest possible dry dock should have the same opportunity of coming to St. John as they would have to Halifax and Quebec. I thought, therefore, in fairness to the port of St. John, that it should have a dry dock of the same size.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When the late Government laid down the policy of assisting in the construction of dry docks by giving an annual subsidy for a period of years, the different ports were placed in the same position and it was anticipated that dry docks should be built by companies. With this understanding, the different ports had the same opportunity, through private enterprise, of securing the construction of dry docks, but now that the Government is determined to build dry docks as Government works at Quebec and Halifax, which are, of course, competing ports with St. John, the minister can easily see that a difficulty would be thrown in the way of a dry dock being constructed at St. John by private enterprise. Of course, Government dry docks have the advantages of cheap rates which the Government necessarily feels called upon to give to those using the docks, and a dock owned by a private company is not nearly so likely to be a successful enterprise, as it would if it were in competition only with company-owned docks. I would like the minister to consider that circumstance, and perhaps he may decide that it would be desirable to construct the dry dock at St. John as a Government work,

as the dry docks at Halifax, Quebec and Esquimalt are being constructed.

Mr. ROGERS: There is a good deal of force in the suggestion of my hon. friend, but at the same time I find myself in the position of having a contract with a reputable company for the carrying out of the construction of this particular dry dock at St. John, and I do not know that it would be possible to make any change. However, the matter will be fully considered.

Toronto harbour improvements, $1,000,000.

Mr. PROULX: I understood they were to dredge in the bay there, and deposit the material taken out on the shore.

Mr. ROGERS: That is quite right.

Mr. PROULX: Have they done much of that work?

Mr. ROGERS: They are building their dredges, and will get started very shortly.

Vancouver harbour improvements, $1,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is this vote for?

Mr. ROGERS: It is for a very important public wharf between Salisbury and Commercial streets.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We voted $1,000,000 last year, and there is this year $1,000,000, which seems a great deal of money for a wharf where there is no dredging to be done. What is the length of the wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: 800 feet long and 300 feet wide.

Mr. PUGSLEY: 800 feet out in the water?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, and the vote includes dredging at False creek as well.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it a concrete wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Any British Columbia pine in it?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, there is some in the foundations.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the Halifax drydock been taken over by the Government?

Mr. ROGERS: The proposed new dry dock has nothing to do with the old dry dock.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it near where the old dry dock was?

Mr. ROGERS: It is across the river on the Dartmouth side, which was selected by the engineers as the most suitable.

Public buildings—Nova Scotia, $365,000.

Mr. ROGERS: These are just the same Estimates as were passed last year; there is nothing new in them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I wish to ask a question about the Amherst post office. What was the cost of the site?

Mr. ROGERS: $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the size of the lot?

Mr. ROGERS: 93 by 95.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is only fair to say to the minister that my information is that that land was purchased by some parties not very long ago, before it was acquired by the Government, for $15,000, and the Government decided to take the property and build a new post office. Expropriation proceedings were commenced; but when the case was about to come to trial, the Crown settled with the owners at $30,000, the price which the minister named. That was double what the property cost the purchasers a comparatively short time before and after there was an agitation for the erection of a new post office. $30,000 seems a very high price for the property.

Mr. RHODES: Inasmuch as the matter refers to my constituency and has been brought up by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) perhaps I may be permitted to say a word or two. There is nothing in the record of the department to show the price paid for the land by the vendor to the Government. As a matter of fact, there is no secret about it. I think the price is somewhat in the neighbourhood of $$16,000 to $17,000. That is what it represented to the vendor in his outlay plus interest.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The party purchased for $16,000 or $17,000 the property for which the Crown paid $30,000. That would represent a profit to the vendor of some $13,000. What is the name of the gentleman who made the profit of $13,000?

Mr. RHODES: Mr. H. G. Hagen. This information is, I believe, accurate. The whole point is whether or not the Government paid a fair price for the land, and speaking for myself, I have absolutely no doubt that the Government got the land at a fair and reasonable price. The site is in the heart of the town of Amherst, which has a population of about 11,000, and which, if it continues to grow at the rate at which it was growing two years ago, will in 1920 have

a population of about 20,000. The price paid for the land represents $325 per front foot, with a depth of 93 feet. There is also in the rear a right of way 12 feet wide, which practically means that the lot is 105 feet in depth for the purpose of the post office. Land immediately in front of this site has been purchased by people for their own use as a business site. In one instance a lot 75 feet in depth was purchased a year before by a merchant who paid $525 per front foot. In another case, within nine months of the purchase of this piece of land by the Government, a lot 50 feet in depth, without any right of way at the rear opposite this lot and not more than 75 feet down the street, was bought by a merchant for $450 per front foot for his own private use. Perhaps land upon the side of the street on which this lot is situated is not quite as valuable as it is on the other side; but for the purpose of a post office site to the Government, it is quite as valuable and possibly more so, inasmuch at it is hoped to use the old post office building for a customs house and the new post office is to be used for the post office, and both being upon the same side of the street, it will enable a more advantageous exchange of parcels between the post office and the customs house and vice versa. With respect to the question whether a post office ought to be built or not, I think that matter was gone into last year. The Post Office Department itself felt, even before the parcel post system was installed, which called for additional room, that the business of the town was growing so rapidly that the post office was crowded, and it asked the Public Works Department for an increase in facilities. An engineer was sent down, through no effort of my own, but as a matter of departmental routine, and he prepared a plan which, according to his own estimate, called for the expenditure of $40,000, although it meant simply an addition to the existing building and only a makeshift which would provide for the needs of the town for only a short time and which would not be sufficient for the accommodation which the growth would call for in a few years. Therefore, it was felt that, instead of spending $40,000 and having post office accommodation which would last only a few years, and inferior accommodation for the customs house, it would be better to spend a few more thousand dollars and have first-class accommodation for both the post office and the customs. Therefore it is in the public interest that the department has decided upon the erection of a new post office.

[Mr. Rhodes.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: How long before the Government expropriated this property was it that Mr. Hazen bought the site for $16,000?

Mr. RHODES: Perhaps six or nine months. I am speaking from memory, and I have had no occasion to refresh my memory.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Some six or nine months before the Government expropriated the property, it had been bought by this gentleman for an amount which my hon. friend says with interest would reach $16,000 or $17,000, and the Government paid this gentleman something over $30,000 for it. Before I left office, there was an order, which I feel sure is on record in the department, that all examiners must state any recent transfers of property which had been purchased.

Mr. RHODES: That was carried out.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend said there was no record in the department of the cost. Therefore it could not have been carried out.

Mr. RHODES: I had not that in mind at the time I was speaking, but I am inclined to think it will be found that the report of the inspector will disclose the cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I gave a general order to the inspector that all examiners must state any recent transfers of property which had been purchased. Will the minister be good enough to produce the report of the examiner at a convenient time before these Estimates finally pass?

Mr. ROGERS: We shall be glad to produce any reports we have, but an error appears to have crept in here. This particular property was expropriated by the department. The matter was referred to the Exchequer Court, and the price of $385 per foot was fixed by the judge of the Exchequer Court, not by the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My information is that the price was settled by agreement.

Mr. ROGERS: My information is that it was fixed by the Exchequer Court.

Mr. MACDONALD: The order was passed by consent. I remember seeing it at the time the court was sitting in Halifax.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is a pretty big profit.

Mr. ROGERS: When the department referred the matter to the Exchequer Court and the order came back placing a value of $30,000 on the property we had not any more to say.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Surely the counsel for the Crown would not consent to have a valuation without consulting the minister.

Mr. ROGERS: When this property was valued by the officers of the Public Works Department, they set a value of $325 a foot. It was referred to the Exchequer Court, and after the judge had given it consideration, he came to the conclusion that the price suggested by the officer of $325 a foot was fair and reasonable, and that was his finding.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the minister is misinformed. My information is that the judge passed no judgment, but the counsel for the Crown accepted this price.

Mr. RHODES: I know something of the circumstances of this case. As a matter of fact, the Government inspectors and valuators were convinced that the price was fair and reasonable, as I was and am. But I found out, when the purchase was proposed to be made, that the price which had been paid by the vendor was a good deal different from the price which he was about to receive from the Government, and I suggested that the matter be sent to the Exchequer Court. My letter will probably be found on the files. I said, that while I had no doubt as to the value of the land, yet, in order to avoid all suspicion, I should like to see the question go to the Exchequer Court. At the sittings of the court held in Halifax last autumn, the case was called and a number of witnesses were there ready to proceed. Judge Cassels was presiding. He asked what was the point in the case; and the counsel for the Government—who was not the man it had been proposed should represent the Government, but, I believe, had been called in a very short time before the case was heard—said that the Government had offered $325 a front foot, but the vendor was asking something like $400 a foot. The judge said: "I think that $325 a foot is a reasonable price," or something of that kind, and suggested that the vendor should accept it. There was a conference, and the vendor agreed to accept the price, and judgment went on that ground.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Without evidence?

Mr. RHODES: One witness was called as a matter of fact. So far as I am concerned, I welcome any inquiry with regard to this land; there is no mystery about it. I have no hesitation in going on record as saying that I believe the Government got good value for its money.

10 p.m.

Mr. PARDEE: What is the population?

Mr. RHODES: Eleven thousand, and growing rapidly.

Mr. MARCIL: The population is not growing just now.

Mr. RHODES: No, for the same reason that other towns are not growing—for the same reason that the city of Montreal is not growing. And I want to say, what hon. members know full well, that many towns in other parts of Canada, especially towns in the West, having only half the population of Amherst, would think that land was going ridiculously cheap if as good sites as this were bought within their borders for $325 a foot.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is an unfortunate thing, when hon. gentlemen wanted to go to the Exchequer Court to allay suspicion, that they did not allow evidence in the matter.

Mr. ROGERS: That was for the judge to say.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The counsel for the Crown consented to pay $325 a foot. Will the minister please bring down the information that has been asked for?

Mr. MARCIL: Is the post office going to cost $70,000 besides the cost of the land?

Mr. ROGERS: It will cost $63,000 besides the land.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does that include the fittings?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It will probably run over $70,000.

Amherst—drill hall, $10,000.

Mr. PARDEE: Seventy thousand dollars was voted last year. Will this drill hall cost more than $70,000?

Mr. ROGERS: It will cost altogether $108,000.

Mr. MARCIL: How many regiments are there there?

Mr. RHODES: There is one regiment for the county—the 93rd Battalion. And at the

time the Government agreed to construct the drill hall, I put in an application for the formation of a city regiment for the town of Amherst and have been pressing upon the minister for weeks and weeks to get the Order in Council passed necessary to form this regiment. We have the list of officers complete and are ready to go ahead and complete the establishment. When that is done there will be two regiments.

Mr. DEVLIN: Does that mean that $105,000 is to be spent for a drill hall for a regiment in Amherst before that regiment is formed?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is no regiment in Amherst. There is the 93rd Battalion, a regiment for the county, with headquarters at Springhill, where there is an armoury.

Mr. RHODES: That armoury cost about $2,000, and there ought to be a better building there. If I am spared to represent the county for a few years to come, I will make every effort to see that a first-class drill hall is put up in Springhill. I may add that there is no county in Canada in which this expenditure would be more warranted than in Cumberland, for I do not know of any county that, in proportion to its population, has contributed as many men for the overseas contingent. In the last recruiting for the third contingent, the town of Amherst recruited about as many men as either Halifax or St. John—at all events, within one or two of as many as Halifax.

Mr. KYTE: Not as many as the county of Cape Breton, where there is no armoury.

Mr. RHODES: The county of Cape Breton has three times our population.

Mr. DEVLIN: I do not wish to delay the minister's Estimates, but it does seem objectionable that $70,000 has already been spent, and more is to be spent, on a drill shed for a regiment, which, as I understand, the minister has not yet been authorized.

Mr. RHODES: The drill hall is in use to-day.

Mr. DEVLIN: That is what I want to know.

Mr. RHODES: It has been used for weeks past as an instructional school for officers for overseas contingents. Every day it is being used in connection with the mobilization of troops. We have the honour to have in the town of Amherst at the present time the 22nd French Canadian regiment, and perhaps I may be permitted to say, for the benefit of our friends from the province of Quebec, that the people of Amherst are delighted with the physique and the appearance of the men of this regiment. Every letter I receive is loud in its praises of the men, not only as soldiers, but as men; their conduct has been exemplary in every respect.

Mr. DEVLIN: I thank the hon. member for his kind comment. It is natural that the men from the province of Quebec—I except, of course, present company—should be men of fine physique. We are glad to know that the French Canadians have visited the town of Amherst. Can the hon. gentleman tell me how many officers use that drill hall?

Mr. RHODES: There are probably 150 officers in the town at the present time. The 22nd French Canadian regiment, which is composed almost entirely of Roman Catholics, has not had a building sufficiently large for the purposes of worship, and they have been using the building on Sundays for church purposes. It has been used also for quartermaster's stores; I believe that every inch of space in the building has been used for weeks past in connection with the presence in the town of the 22nd French Canadian regiment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister of Militia informed the House that a portion of the factory buildings had been rented by the Government for the purposes of the troops.

Mr. RHODES: The minister did not inform the House any such thing. A portion of the Canadian Car and Foundry Company's buildings there is being used as quarters for the men; the drill hall would not accommodate one quarter of the regiments which consist of nearly 2,000 men. No rent is being paid; no one has been asked for the payment of rent, and no one is expected to pay it. There will be, I presume, small payments for such damage as has been done to the building and any expense to which the company has been put by reason of the occupation, but this compensation will be small.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why were these men taken from large centres like Montreal and Quebec and sent to a comparatively small place like Amherst?

Mr. ROGERS: That is a matter which comes under the control of the Militia Department.

Mr. RHODES: The move was made at the request of the colonel in command of the regiment. It was felt that these men, who were in St. John, were rather too near their homes to enable the best discipline to be enforced and the best training to be obtained. They had to be moved some distance away, and there was no better place to take them to than the town of Amherst. I am very glad to have been instrumental in pointing out to the minister the advantages of the town of Amherst in this respect.

Bridgetown, post office, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it intended to go on with this work during the present year?

Mr. ROGERS: It is hoped that we may be able to do so later.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Have the plans been prepared?

Mr. ROGERS: Not yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the land been purchased?

Mr. ROGERS: Not yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is a revote?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Canning public building, $15,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has any progress been made with this work?

Mr. ROGERS: I understand that expropriation proceedings are being taken, but nothing has been settled up to date.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has anything been done towards erecting the building?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister will remember that a rather interesting story was told, I think by the hon. member for Richmond, in regard to this matter last session. He pointed out that Sir Frederick Borden had offered a free site which, if I remember the story correctly, was in a suitable place in the town of Canning. This site was approved at a public meeting held in the town; Sir Frederick Borden was thanked for his generous offer and a description of the site was sent to the minister, who acknowledged receipt of the offer. It appears, however, that certain political friends of one Mr. Eaton were anxious that a site should be purchased from him, and I understand that the department was pressed to conclude a bargain with Mr. Eaton for the purchase from him of a piece of land which many of the inhabitants thought was entirely unsuitable for the purpose. Mr. Eaton was to receive $2,000 for this site. When the land was measured it was found to be not large enough, and it became necessary to incorporate with Mr. Eaton's land a piece of land adjoining, which also belonged tor Sir Frederick Borden. The department offered Sir Frederick Borden $1,100 for the strip of land which was to be added to Mr. Eaton's land, but Sir Frederick said that $1,100 was altogether too much. He refused the offer, and I understand that a suit as to the value of the land was brought by the department and defended by Sir Frederick Borden. Evidently the reason why the department was pushing the $1,100 on Sir Frederick was, as they said in the correspondence, to take the curse off the Eaton lot. As they had estimated the lot adjoining Sir Frederick's at $2,000, they thought Sir Frederick should be paid proportionally $1,100 for his strip. I understand Sir Frederick resisted the offer and went to law about it with the department. It would be interesting to know the result of that trial. Has it been settled yet?

Mr. ROGERS: It has not been settled at all. I am not acquainted with the details, but I know that no suit has been brought in the Exchequer Court.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I should like to know what the policy of the department is in regard to post office buildings. I understand that Canning is a village of only 500 or 600 people, yet here is an appropriation for a public building there costing $15,000. Prior to 1911 a site was purchased by the late Government for a post office in the town of Camrose in my own constituency. It is a very thriving little place with a population of 2,000, and with all the modern facilities that are to be found in our western towns. I have repeatedly asked the Minister of Public Works for a building suitable to the requirements of the town, but I can get no satisfaction whatever. Camrose has seven railways radiating from it, and yet the post office is located in a rented building, although the Government has had a site purchased ever since 1910. It looks to me as if the erection of public buildings was merely a political move, and this is rather a glaring case. Without any reason or justification whatever, the demands of the progressive people of a flourishing little town like Camrose are ignored and places with one-tenth the

population, Bear River for instance, are getting public buildings.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend is in error in respect to Canning. I see the population is 1,000.

Mr. KYTE: That is the whole polling subdivision.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend says he has been pressing upon me the erection of a public building at Camrose. I must confess I have no recollection of it at the moment.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I am sorry I have to refresh the minister's memory, but the minister faithfully promised me two years ago that a building would be put up there.

Mr. ROGERS: If I did, it must be done.

Public Buildings, N.S.—Chester public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the population of Chester?

Mr. ROGERS: It is a summer resort. I see its population in summer is 1,096.

Mr. KYTE: Chester is not an incorporated town. It is a village with a population of about 400. The figures given by the minister are the census returns for the polling subdivision.

Mr. ROGERS: The information I have here is that it is a town of 1,096. It is noted for its beautiful scenery, making it one of the most delightful summer resorts, nine miles distance from the finest views the country affords. The town has five churches, express and telegraph offices, saw-mills, three hotels and twenty-one stores. It is quite an important place.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it intended to do anything with this money this year?

Mr. ROGERS: We hope to.

Halifax customs examining warehouse, $100,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is that a new building?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, it has not been started yet. The plans are not prepared, but we hope to erect the building within this amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I presume nothing will be done this year.

Mr. ROGERS: The plans have not been prepared.

Halifax drill hall for 63rd Regiment, $45,000.

[Mr. Douglas.]

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is this a second drill hall?

Mr. ROGERS: Apparently. Nothing has been done yet in connection with the work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it intended to have a drill hall for each regiment?

Mr. ROGERS: Halifax is quite a military city.

Mr. DEVLIN: What will be the total cost of the drill hall?

Mr. ROGERS: I have no idea. The plans are not prepared yet.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the site been purpurchased?

Mr. ROGERS: The proposal is that the regiment should contribute the site.

Hantsport public building, $9,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I see that is a revote. Will anything be done this year? Has the land been bought?

Mr. ROGERS: The site has been purchased, but the plans have not been prepared.

Mahone Bay public building, $2,000.

Mr. KYTE: What is the population of Mahone Bay?

Mr. ROGERS: 951.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the total amount to be expended there?

Mr. ROGERS: This $2,000 is for the site. Plans have not been drawn up for the building. We shall give careful consideration to the price and spend no more than is necessary in the public interest. Mahone Bay is in the constituency of Lunenburg.

Mr. MARCIL: Are there any public buildings in that constituency at present?

Mr. ROGERS: I am not acquainted with the different towns.

Mr. KYTE: There is one in the town of Lunenburg and one in the town of Bridgewater.

Mr. MARCIL: I have heard at least two or three of the minister's predecessors say that every constituency in Canada should have at least one public building. I know some constituencies that have none. Votes were put in the Estimates for some of these places, but afterwards struck out. I see other constituencies are getting two or three public buildings.

Mr. KYTE: This is the same constituency Chester is in; so this will make four public buildings for the constituency of Lunenburg.

Middleton public building, $15,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What constituency is that in?

Mr. ROGERS: Annapolis.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that the total amount to be expended there?

Mr. ROGERS: I think this amount should be sufficient for a public building in a town of that size.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has land been purchased?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

North Sydney public building—improvements, $5,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: What improvements do you propose to make in North Sydney?

Mr. ROGERS: An addition to examining warehouse, front porch, additional windows and tower clock.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am glad the minister is putting in the tower clock. There were three clocks in prospect; one was put in at Baddeck and it was intended to put one in at North Sydney and Sydney. It is about time that the minister was making an extension to the building at North Sydney. He is paying a pretty high rent there for the building that is now being used as an examining warehouse. They refused to rent the building from the real owner because he was not of the right stripe or colour. The owner had to rent his place to a middleman at $15 a monh, and the middleman immediately rented it to the department at $30 a month. The minister will find that to be the case from the records in the Department of Public Works. That is the way the Government business is being done at the present time.

Port Hawkesbury public building, $3,000.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Has the site been purchased for this building?

Mr. ROGERS: No, nothing has been done.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Has there been any attempt to purchase a site?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes; we have some correspondence and reports, but nothing has been concluded.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Is it the intention of the minister to proceed with the erection of this building?

Mr. ROGERS: We shall proceed as fast as we do with any of the others.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The erection of this building has been in contemplation for the last four years. This item is quite old. It was in the Estimates in 1911, it remained in 1912, it was dropped in 1913, and now it comes back again. I understand an effort has been made to purchase the site.

Mr. ROGERS: If we have been working at it as long as that it is about time we got under way.

Shubenacadie public building, $2,000.

Mr. KYTE: How much is it intended to expend on this building?

Mr. ROGERS: The population is 1,516. The site has not been purchased yet. This amount is only to purchase the site.

Sydney Mines public building—improvements, repairs, etc., $2,500.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does that include the cost of the tower?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, that is for the cost of the tower.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hope the minister will put in both of these clocks during the coming summer.

Mr. ROGERS: We have a number of clocks on the way from England and they are expected very shortly. We have given an order for thirty or forty clocks and they are on the way.

Mr. MARCIL: Where do these clocks come from?

Mr. ROGERS: We buy them from three English firms—Evans & Co., Joyce & Co., and Smith & Co.

Buctouche building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the site been purchased?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is anything to be done this year—any plans prepared?

Mr. ROGERS: The plans are prepared for some of these buildings in New Brunswick.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I see that a good many of these votes for New Brunswick public buildings are revotes.

Mr. ROGERS: We are going ahead with the preparation of the plans in the department.

Chatham public building, addition, $12,000.

Mr. LOGGIE: Are the plans ready for this building and has anything been done? When will the contract be called for? This item has been in the Estimates for a number of years, the land lying idle and the minister encouraged the belief last year that the work would be undertaken. People in my town would be glad to know what the prospects are for the present year in that regard.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend will remember that this item was under discussion last June a year ago and he is quite right as to his statement as to what I said then. The plans were given out to be prepared by an outside architect, there was some delay and the work had not been making progress up to the time when the war broke out, since which time very few contracts have been let. That explains why the delay has occurred in carrying out this work. It will go on as soon as possible.

Mr. LOGGIE: Can we hope for the work going on this year?

Mr. ROGERS: You will be entitled to have the same hope as all others in connection with any works as soon as conditions clear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought that the Minister of Finance had cleared all the conditions in connection with his new taxes.

Mr. ROGERS: They will always help.

St. John, N.B.—custom house improvements, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What are these improvements?

Mr. HAZEN: Electric lighting.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that tenders were recently called for electric lighting?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that the lowest tenderer has been urging that changes ought to be made which would make his work less expensive, and I am sure the minister will agree with me that it would not be fair to make any changes without calling for new tenders. I think the contractor ought to be compelled to adhere to the original specifications on which he tendered, and if changes are to be made then tenders should be called for again. I mention this especially to the minister so that his attention may be called to it.

Mr. ROGERS: Tenders were called for and the contract has been let to the lowest tenderer and a certain amount of work has been done by the contractor. He now represents that the specifications were not what they should be and he came to Ottawa and I looked into the matter myself with the result that I have sent the chief electrician to St. John to make a report on the conditions, so that we can decide what is best to be done in the public interest.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am sure the minister will agree with me that if a contractor cannot perform his contract the work should be taken from him and new tenders called. There should be no encouragement given to men to tender below what they think the work is worth, in the hope that they may be able to induce the department to make it easier for them later. That apparently is what the contractor is seeking in this case. The others tendered on the understanding that they would be compelled to carry out the specifications to the letter. When I was minister the rule I adopted was that if any changes were to be made the contract should be cancelled and the work let out again to tender, and given to the lowest.

Mr. HAZEN: The gentleman to whom this contract was awarded was very much lower than any other who tendered, and while I naturally would like to see the work go to a St. John firm, I could not find fault with the minister for accepting the lowest tender, which was sent in by a reputable firm in Montreal. I am informed that the contractor is willing to carry out the work according to specifications, and he says that in doing so he will have a reasonable margin of profit, but when he went to St. John to do the work, it was represented to him in writing by the collector of customs, the agent of the Marine Department, the agent of the Inland Revenue Department, and others who used the building, that the plan for lighting the building was not in the public interest, and that important changes ought to be made. The allegation is that the official who drew the plan had before him the plan of the customs house as it was before the serious fire which occurred some years ago. The specifications required that all the gas pipes in the building should be taken out, and it is represented by the collector of customs that both in the inland revenue and customs offices they require gas in order that cer-

tain tests may be made. I understand that the contractor has no objection whatever to fulfil his contract at the price at which he undertook it, but, because of the representations made to him by these officials, he thought it necessary to place the matter before the department. I entirely agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) that when a contractor enters into a contract he should carry it out according to the specifications, but in this case, as I understand it, the Minister of Public Works has instructed the official charged with the superintendence of electric lighting in the different public buildings throughout the Dominion, to go to St. John and make a report.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My information is that there would be a very marked difference in the cost of doing the work if these changes are made which are asked for by the gentleman who was the lowest tenderer. I am also informed that other tenderers inquired of the chief architect as to whether any changes would be allowed, and pointing out the changes which they thought desirable to make, and which could be made without disadvantage, and the chief architect informed one or more of them by wire that no changes would be permitted, and that the work must be done strictly in accordance with the specifications. These gentlemen tendered accordingly. The Minister of Marine must see how unfair it would be to the others who tendered if these changes were allowed to be made to the advantage of the lowest tenderer. If any changes are to be made the work should again be put up to competition.

Mr. HAZEN: I am simply telling my hon. friend the statements which have been made to me in regard to the matter. The price of the lowest tenderer was just about one-half of that of most of the other tenderers. There was another company which tendered from the city of Ottawa, which was just a few hundred dollars higher than the lowest tenderer which was selected. The gentleman who was awarded the contract states that he is perfectly prepared to carry on the work according to the specifications and that he has no desire to be relieved of the contract, because he will make a fair margin of profit on it. But, he thinks in view of the strong representations made to him by the officials in St. John, he ought to report the matter to the Department of Public Works before proceeding.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the minister decides to make these changes, in all fairness the work should be put up to tender again and the present contractor paid for what work he has done.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend will admit that I have taken the proper course by sending the chief electrician to St. John, and when I get his report I will give it my best consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is all I ask of the minister.

St. George public building, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If I recollect aright, there was an appropriation made for this work when I was minister, and certainly it seems a long time to keep the amount in the Estimates. Is there any reason why this work was not commenced before? It is now upwards of three years since the change of Government, and while it seems as if the Government is desirous of erecting the building by keeping the amount in the Estimates, there should not be such a long delay in taking steps towards the erection of the building.

Mr. ROGERS: We have taken steps in connection with it. Tenders have been called for; but the tenders received were thought by the chief architect to be too high, and the matter is under consideration with a view of calling for new tenders to bring the price down to a reasonable figure.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What were the tenders?

Mr. ROGERS: One for $36,000 and one for $42,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is a pity the member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) does not represent St. George. I am sure he would have no difficulty in getting that tender accepted.

St. John new post office, $75,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will this expenditure finish the work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Beauport public building, $20,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has this work been started?

Mr. ROGERS: No. We have secured the site.

Mr. MARCIL: Was this appropriation voted last year for the first time?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not remember whether it was voted before last year or not.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the population of Beauport? It is a country village outside of Quebec.

Mr. ROGERS: The parish has a population of 3,456.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister has not the limits of that parish. It is a pretty large parish.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who represents the constituency in which Beauport is situated?

Mr. ROGERS: The Postmaster General.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How much is the building to cost?

Mr. ROGERS: Between $25,000 and $30,000. Tenders were called for; the lowest tender received was $33,000 and the highest $49,000. It was thought by the architect that we could get a building at a little less cost than that.

Bedford public building, $10,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has any work been done on this building?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. MARCIL: Has a site been secured?

Mr. ROGERS: Not yet.

Berthier new public building, $10,000.

Mr. SEGUIN (Translation): Has the site been secured?

Mr. ROGERS (Translation): No.

Mr. SEGUIN (Translation): In the estimates of 1912-1913, there was an item of $10,000 for a public building at Saint Lin, a town in the Laurentian country. The population of Saint Lin is larger by a few hundred than that of Berthier. It was thought advisable to omit the amount which had been put in the Estimates for the Saint Lin, while an amount was put in for Berthier. I have no objection to an appropriation being made for Berthier, but I protest against the omission of the item for Saint Lin. I fail to see why the latter place should be discriminated against and its appropriation dropped from the Estimates, while the item for Berthier is retained.

Mr. ROGERS: I am glad that my hon. friend approved the site to the appropriation for the town of Berthier, which is an important town of about 1,500 people. I do not know the population of the town to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. SEGUIN (Translation): The population using the post-office at Saint Lin is a few hundred more than that at Berthier. In any case, I do not wish to rest my complaint on these figures. I do not wish in the least to annoy the department regarding its good treatment of Berthier; on the contrary I am quite gratified at the news that Berthier is getting a public building. But I must protest loudly because the constituency of L'Assomption is not on the part of the Minister of Public Works the object of the same treatment as the constituency of Berthier. I fail to understand why St. Lin should be discriminated against. The minister is not unaware that an Order-in-Council had been passed for the purchase of the site; the plans and specifications had been prepared. I will ask the minister if he intends one day or another to include once more in the Estimates that item which has been omitted, and thus ensure to this Laurentian town the treatment it is entitled to.

Mr. ROGERS: While the case of Berthier has been pressed upon me, I am afraid my hon. friend has never pressed for the construction of a public building at St. Lin.

Mr. SEGUIN (Translation): The minister states that I have not pressed my request. The opposite is the truth. I have never forgotten to bring up the matter at session after session, so much so that last year I was told that there were more important and more pressing public works than this post office still in abeyance; but I expected at this session to see this item again in the Estimates. I had as a matter of fact asked if it were the minister's intention to carry on this work, and he replied that such was his intention. I therefore conclude that since there are new grants for Nova Scotia and the other provinces, the same treatment should be meted out to the province of Quebec and particularly St. Lin.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend says that the population of St. Lin is about 400 more than the population of Berthier.

Mr. ROGERS: The hon. member has not pressed for the erection of a public building at St. Lin. I can appreciate my hon. friend pressing his claim for his town. He will observe, however, that in the present Estimates there are no new items this year; they are all simply revotes.

Mr. SEGUIN (Translation): I am quite aware that the amount for the Berthier post office was put in the Estimates last year; but when it was put in, the amount for St.

Lin was struck out, and this year the vote for St. Lin was not renewed.

Mr. ROGERS: When the time comes when we are asking for new votes, we shall be glad to give consideration to the recommendation of my hon. friend.

Mr. SEGUIN (Translation): As I do not wish to take up the time of the committee unnecessarily, I shall not insist further. I stand by my protest and am thankful to the minister for the hope he holds out for the future.

Coaticook—armoury, $21,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Does this complete the work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the total cost?

Mr. ROGERS: Forty-one thousand dollars.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there a regiment in Coaticook?

Mr. ROGERS: I will have to get that information from the Minister of Militia. Surely they would not recommend an armoury if there was no use for it.

Mr. MARCIL: I can tell the hon. minister that there is no regiment there. There may be one or two militia companies.

Gaspé public buillding, $25,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has nothing been done in Gaspé?

Mr. ROGERS: No; we called for tenders, but on account of the expense we could not go on.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the site been acquired?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: From whom?

Mr. ROGERS: Under an Order in Council passed in September, 1912, the purchase of a site was authorized from the Rev. Father Gauthier, parish priest of Douglastown and Mr. Isidore Morin, of Gaspé, for $500 and $300 respectively.

Mr. MARCIL: I might as well bring in my complaint here, I suppose, and I hope the minister will listen to me. In 1910 I had an estimate put in for a public building in New Carlisle, the county seat of Bonaventure, going on the principle laid down by several Ministers of Public Works that in each constituency there should be a public building. I thought that in New Carlisle, the county seat, with a postal revenue from $1,500 to $1,800 and a population of about a thousand more or less, there ought to be a public building. But something happened and it was struck out. And later another item appeared for a public building for Gaspé Basin. I do not know why the vote for the shire town should be left out and a vote put in for Gaspé, for it is a small place of less than three hundred people. I think an injustice is done to New Carlisle, for we had a fair claim to that public building.

11 p.m.

Mr. ROGERS: I appreciate what the hon. gentleman has said, and apparently from his statement he has a good case. While I cannot promise him that anything will be done immediately, the matter will certainly have consideration later on.

Grand'Mère public building, inclusive of 5 per cent interest on balance due on site, $20,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Will that complete?

Mr. ROGERS: No. I move that the words "inclusive of 5 per cent interest on balance due on site" be struck out. It was put in by some mistake.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Nothing has been done there, apparently.

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Amendment agreed to.

Gross Isle quarantine station—new buildings, $150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is a very large amount.

Mr. ROGERS: It is very necessary for work in connection with the Department of Agriculture.

Hull post office—repairs to fence, levelling and sodding grounds, etc., $1,000.

Mr. DEVLIN: What has been the delay in this work? It is very necessary.

Mr. ROGERS: There has been some difference of opinion as to the cost of the work. We do not appear to be able to get value for what we are prepared to spend. But we will make another effort and see if we can get the work carried out.

Mr. DEVLIN: Hull is a city of twenty thousand people and—

Mr. ROGERS: Oh, this is a work that will have to be carried out.

Mr. DEVLIN: It is absolutely necessary; and I think the time has come when the Government should increase the size of the Hull post office to suit the increased popu-

dation. The place is really too small for the needs of the people; the waiting hall should be enlarged.

Mr. ROGERS: The post office in Hull is a very neat little building but probably too small.

Mr. DEVLIN: It is a good building, but it should be increased in size.

Mr. ROGERS: We should be glad to have that looked into.

Jonquières public building, $20,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has anything been done there?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. This completes the contract.

Mr. MARCIL: How much is the total cost of the building?

Mr. ROGERS: Thirty-three thousand dollars.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the population?

Mr. ROGERS: It is 2,354.

Mr. MARCIL: That many using this post office? I never heard of it.

Mr. ROGERS: That is the record before me—that according to the census of 1911, the population was 2,354.

Montreal Postal Station A, St. James street, $160,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that the Carslake property, so-called?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the Montreal Herald of this evening there are some very serious statements with regard to this property. If these statements are true, it appears that an effort has been made to induce the Government to pay a much larger sum for this property than it is worth. I shall not go into the matter to-night, but I should like the minister to let this item stand, as some gentlemen from Montreal may wish to discuss it.

Mr. ROGERS: There is no objection to letting the item stand. I should like to say that we have placed all the correspondence with regard to this matter on the table of the House, and I suggest that every hon. gentleman who is interested should read that correspondence. There never was a grosser misrepresentation than that which has appeared in the press from time to time in connection with this property. The best valuators that we could find in Montreal valued the property at $400,000, and our officers valued it at the same amount. We made an offer of $325,000, which was refused, and the matter is now before Judge Cassels. We have retained two of the best lawyers in Montreal to see that our evidence is properly presented, and that a fair and proper value is placed upon the property.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This paper states that three Montreal real estate dealers have stated in writing that the property is dear at $190,000.

Mr. ROGERS: Three of the best real estate men in Montreal valued the property at from $300,000 to $400,000. The hon. gentleman will find full information in the report which has been laid upon the table of the House.

Item stands.

Quebec post office, enlargements and alterations, $200,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the total amount to be expended there?

Mr. ROGERS: The contract was $385,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the postal business at that office warrant this outlay? I believe that the business has been falling off.

Mr. ROGERS: Quebec is an important place, and I take it that the post office business is increasing rather than falling off.

Mr. MARCIL: There might be need of additional postal facilities in the outskirts of Quebec, but I do not think that any are required in this locality, which, as the hon. gentleman probably knows, is not growing.

Mr. ROGERS: The revenue for 1912-13 was $185,844, and for 1913-14 $184,362.20.

Mr. MARCIL: I have given some little attention to the postal situation in Montreal. A central post office is good in many ways in Montreal, but what is far more useful is sub-stations distributed throughout the district. A central station in the heart of the city is used practically only by those people living or working near it, and I think it would be good policy for the minister to remember in future that if he wants to give real postal facilities to the people he should distribute the stations as much as possible, instead of having one big station in the heart of the city.

Mr. ROGERS: I think my hon. friend is right in that.

Ste. Agathe des Monts public building, $25,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has anything been done in connection with that?

Mr. ROGERS: We have been going ahead with the work for some time.

Stanstead Plain public building, $10,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What would be the total cost of that building?

Mr. ROGERS: $34,000.

St. Gabriel de Brandon public building, $7,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What will be the total cost of that building, and what was the cost of the site?

Mr. ROGERS The site cost $2,000. The contract was for $21,000, exclusive of the site.

St. Jacques de l'Achigan public building, $15,000.

Mr. PROULX: Does the minister intend to go on with this work this year? The hon. member for Montcalm has urged several times that this building be started.

Mr. ROGERS: We have bought the site.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That site was bought in 1908. Seven years is a long time to wait for the building.

St. Laurent public building, $5,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that to complete the work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

St. Ours public building, $15,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What will be the total cost there?

Mr. ROGERS: We hope to keep within the estimate.

Westmount drill hall and armoury, $30,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the site been purchased, or any location decided on?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Progress reported.

PRIVATE BILL.

FIRST AND SECOND READING.

Bill No. 120, for the relief of Cecil Howard Lambert.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.23 p.m.

Monday, April 5, 1915.

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

CHARLES ISAAC ALEXANDER DIVORCE BILL.

Mr. McCRANEY: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I gave notice that when motions were called I would move that Bill 118, letter E of the Senate, for the relief of Charles Isaac Alexander, be referred back to the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee. My reason for asking that the Bill be referred back to the committee is this: The Bill went through the Senate Committee unanimously and came down to this House, and went before the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills of this House. That committee required a quorum of ten members. There were 13 who took part in the vote, 7 against the preamble and 6 in favour of it. In view of the small number present, and in view of the history of the Bill up to the present time, I would ask that it be referred back to the committee for further consideration.

Mr. BURNHAM: Surely it would be most objectionable to adopt this proceeding. I was a member of that committee. That Bill was considered and considered carefully; there was a great deal of discussion. There is absolutely no use of putting members on committees if their findings are not going to be adopted, and if Bills are going to be thrown back on them. I protest against this procedure.

Mr. OLIVER: On the other hand, I have not yet heard that this House exists for the purpose of handing over its authority to any of the committees. The committee is a convenient means of bringing out evidence, but it is the House that renders its decision. As a member of the House, not a member of the committee, I do not wish to be held responsible for the decision of the committee.

Mr. W. A. CLARKE: As a member of that committee and one who listened carefully to the discussion by counsel representing the parties, and who voted against the Bill, I feel that this proposition is a reflection upon the members of the committee. Some hon. members who have voted against the Bill have gone home and intend to remain. Consequently, if the Bill is referred back, we have no chance to get another expression of opinion by the committee. I think the motion should stand over.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My attention was directed to this case by Mr. Lougheed, the Chairman of the Divorce Committee in the Senate, and by my hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney). I read over the evidence, and, if it is to be believed, there is absolutely no question that a divorce ought to be granted. The question of the credibility of witnesses is usually left to those who have had the opportunity of observing their demeanour and judging by that as to whether or not they are telling the truth. The Senate committee which heard the witnesses in this case seem to have believed those who were called on behalf of the petitioner. The circumstances put forth by respondent, who was the only witness called in her own behalf, are corroborative to some extent of what was alleged by witnesses for the petitioner. I think the result of this case indicates the absolute necessity of some reform in the methods by which Bills for divorce are considered, because it is manifestly incongruous that a case which depends upon the credibility of witnesses should be decided in favour of the credibility of those witnesses by a committee which heard them and should be decided against the credibility of those witnesses by a committee which did not hear them. There is much in the result to indicate the necessity of some effective reform in the methods by which these Bills are heard. When the case was brought to my attention I took the opportunity of reading the evidence very carefully. It is no reflection whatever upon the members of the Private Bills Committee that any one in this House might entertain an opinion of the result of that evidence different from that which they entertained. The evidence seemed to me to indicate circumstances as strong as any I have ever seen brought forward in this Parliament in favour of a divorce, unless we are absolutely to disbelieve the two witnesses who were called for the petitioner. The evidence was most direct and circumstantial. In so far as I am personally concerned, and with every possible respect for and deference to the opinions of those who entertain a different view, I would be disposed to think that the case might very well be referred again to the Committee on Private Bills.

Motion agreed to.

THE WAR—PROTEST OF BELGIAN GOVERNMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg to lay on the table of the House a communication under date of the 25th March, 1915, from the Consul-General for Belgium, setting forth the protest of the Government of Belgium against the contention on the part of the German Chancellary that as far back as 1906 Belgium had broken her neutrality by the conclusion of an agreement with Great Britain.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 121, to amend the Supreme Court Act. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to give jurisdiction to the Supreme Court to hear and determine appeals from judgments in connection with the contestation of provincial elections in cases where the provincial authorities have provided for such an appeal. One or more of the provinces has provided that there shall be an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. Of course, the provincial legislation cannot give jurisdiction to the Supreme Court but inasmuch as some of the provinces have by their legislation provided for such an appeal, thereby expressing their desire that there should be such an appeal, the purpose of the present Bill is to confer jurisdiction on the Supreme Court to hear such appeals.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Which of the provinces is concerned?

Mr. DOHERTY: Manitoba is one, and it is possible that one or two of the other two western provinces has similar legislation.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

RECRUITS' ATTESTATION PAPERS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir JAMES AIKINS (Brandon): I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to an anachronism or perhaps a blunder that has occurred in the attestation papers required to be signed by recruits previous to enlistment in the overseas expeditionary force, and also in the permanent force of Canada. This error has caused some discussion and perhaps a little irritation on the part of a large body of our citizens. In the particulars which are required to be given in these papers, the recruit has to state the religious denomination to which he belongs, and the religious denominations set out are: Church of England, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, Baptist, Congregationalist, other Protestants, Roman Catholic, Jewish. There is no mention in this list of the Methodists.

That may be accounted for, perhaps, by the fact that the theological section of the Department of Militia has been, like Rip Van Winkle, asleep for about forty years. There was in Canada, over forty years ago, a religious denomination called Wesleyans, but it has ceased to be, and I am quite sure that the Methodists, who are as large a body in Canada as those of the other Protestant denominations specified, are quite as loyal and quite as deserving of being mentioned. I call the attention of the Minister of Militia to this in order that the error and its consequences may hereafter be obviated.

Major General HUGHES: It is quite evident that my good friend (Sir James Aikins) has been asleep himself. It is true that the attestation paper does not contain the word "Methodists," but every one knows that the Methodists are always to the front in every loyal and patriotic cause. No one would suspect that either my good friend or myself, both of whom occupy front seats among the orthodox Methodists at least once a year, would intentionally cast any reflection on the Methodist body. The mistake has been made through our following the English attestation sheet. When I asked for an explanation of it some weeks ago, I was told that our men here simply copied the English sheet, and I, being the head of the theological branch of the Militia Department, was not consulted, or I would have noticed it. The other officers in the department, being only military men, did not observe the effect of the mistake. I may, however, inform my hon. friend that the Wesleyans are not dead, because there are in England hundreds of thousands of the very best citizens who still bear the name of Wesleyans. As I say, we followed the English form, but I can promise my hon. friend that the word "Methodist" will be found in the papers in future. I may say also that there is nothing in the world to prevent a man writing in the word "Methodist," as many of them do, if he wishes to.

CANADIAN AVIATION SCHOOL.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon): I draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to the following despatch, which appears in the newspapers of this morning:

Toronto, April 4.—The first aviation school in Canada will be opened at Lawrence Park on Tuesday. It will be under the direction of Captain E. L. Janney, squadron commander of the Royal Flying Corps. Lieutenant Harley Smith, of Toronto, will look after the military end of the training and some other instructors will soon arrive from England and the United States. Lieutenant Bernard F. Hale, of the Royal Flying Corps, who accompanied Captain Janney to the front, is now on his way to Canada, and will act as adjutant of the school. When completed, the staff of instructors will number six.

The school will open with twelve or fifteen picked pupils, and more will be added as facilities improve. Two hangars are to be started at once, and will be completed in ten days .

The course will extend over four months, and in order to familiarize the pupils with the parts of the machine a complete new machine will be built on the premises. It will embody the latest improvements, and will be a very powerful machine.

In addition to Lawrence Park, the Edgecombe estate of over 200 acres has been placed at the disposal of the school.

I wish to ask if this school is or will be under the direction of the Minister of Militia.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Canadian Government has not instituted or organized any aviation schools up to the present time. If the Admiralty or the War Office should desire us to co-operate in work of that kind, our assistance will be cheerfully afforded by every means in our power. I believe that some representations have been made from certain quarters to the Minister of Militia and Defence, who, being more familiar with the facts, will be better able to speak of them than I.

Major General HUGHES: In regard to the particular instance referred to by the hon. member for the Yukon, I may say that this aviation school has no connection whatever with the Militia Department. Thus far the Militia Department has not had anything to do with aviation corps, either directly or indirectly, and the officers who are advertising themselves in this connection are doing so on their own responsibility. It is purely a private organization and not under the auspices, direction or pay of the Militia Department.

PRIVATE BILL.

The House in committee on Bill No. 107, respecting the patent of John Millen and Son, Limited—Mr. Webster; Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

Mr. OLIVER: As this Bill necessarily affects private rights, an explanation should be given as to its nature and pur-

pose, and as to how far private rights may be affected by it.

Mr. CARROLL: The affidavits in connection with this Bill were placed in my hands, in the absence of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Webster). I will read a copy of the affidavit on which the Bill went through the Senate.

I, Frank Dean Lyman, of the city and district of Montreal, being duly sworn do solemnly depose and say, that

1. I am a director of John Millen and Son, Limited.

2. On or about September 15, 1914, and for some time previously, I alone had full charge of the negotiations, the purchase, and all matters appertaining to the purchase of letters patent No. 114,110, for an improvement in trolley wheels, issued under the seal of the Patent Office of Canada and dated the 15th day of September, 1908, the full right, title and interest in and to which was vested in the Lumen Bearing Company, of the city of Buffalo, in the state of New York, U.S.A., and transferred by the said purchase to the said John Millen and Son, Limited.

3. During the said negotiations no mention whatsoever was made to me of any payments due or to be due of Government fees to maintain the said letters patent of Canada in full force and effect.

4. During the negotiations and for some time previously it was believed by me that the said letters patent of Canada were fully paid up and that no payment of Government fees was required to maintain the patent in full force and effect.

5. During the time from September 1, 1914, to September 14, 1914, I was absent from Montreal on a vacation and could not be reached for instructions before my return to Montreal.

6. During my absence from Montreal there was a large accumulation of matters requiring or believed to require my personal attention, all of which matters were allowed to remain in abeyance until my return on September 14, 1914.

7. On my return on September 14, 1914, I immediately gave the accumulated matters attention and proceeded to dispose of the same with diligence, and on September 15, 1914, I found amongst the said accumulated matters a notice from the said Lumen Bearing Company that a Government fee had to be paid to the Commissioner of Patents for the extension of the term of duration of the said letters patent of Canada, on or before September 15, 1914.

8. On the same day (September 15, 1914,) I mailed a cheque for twenty dollars ($20) to the Commissionr of Patents, Ottawa, to cover an extension of the term of duration of the said letters patent of Canada, believing the said payment would be accepted.

9. The said payment arriving in Ottawa on the night of September 15, 1914, reached the Commissioner of Patents on September 16, 1914.

10. The Patent Office in due time notified the said John Millen and Son, Limited, that the payment was made too late and that the patent had lapsed.

Frank Dean Lyman.

Sworn before me at the city of Montreal, this third day of Februaury, 1915.

Joseph E. Lemire,
Notary Public.

This Bill is very similar to Bills that have passed during the present session, for example, the Bill respecting the patent of the National Wood Distilling Company. It is simply a case where the payment of the fee was overlooked by the gentleman in charge of the company controlling this patent. Such renewals have been granted before by this House, and I understand that two similar Bills have been passed by this House during the present session. I know that many similar Bills have been passed by this House while I have been a member.

With reference to the question raised by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), section 2 of the Bill will safeguard any rights that have accrued from the time that this patent lapsed until the present time, as there is the usual saving clause in the Bill.

On section 2—certain rights saved:

Hon. J. D. REID: How long a time had expired between the date on which the fee should have been paid and the date on which it was paid?

Mr. CARROLL: I think about thirteen days.

Mr. REID: So far no patents have been renewed this session, although there is one before the committee now, unless the fees were remitted on the day of the expiry of the patent; that is, unless they were mailed at the post office to the department and arrived on the evening of the day that they should have been paid to the department.

Mr. CARROLL: That is the case here.

Mr. REID: In this case, the hon. member states that the payment was thirteen days overdue.

Mr. CARROLL: I made a mistake.

Mr. REID: I would like to know exactly when the fee was paid. If it were paid after it should have been paid, I certainly must object to this Bill. There is no case this session where a patent has been renewed unless the money was actually in the possession of the Government on the day it should have been paid; that is, although it was not in the possession of the Department of Agriculture, it was in the post office or in a department of the Government on the day the patent would expire.

Mr. CARROLL: That is the case here. When I had reference to the thirteen days, I had reference to the time the gentleman was absent from his business. The fee was payable on the 15th of September, 1914, and it was mailed that day; but it did not reach the Patent Office until the 16th of September, the following day. That is what the affidavit sets forth.

Mr. REID: Does the evidence of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture show that to be a fact?

Mr. CARROLL: I do not know, as I am not on the Private Bills Committee. This affidavit was simply placed in my hands.

Mr. REID: I have been attending the Private Bills Committee during the whole session, and I have not seen this Bill before. If any members here who are on that committee will say that the Deputy Minister of Agriculture stated that the money had been remitted on the day that the fee was due, then this would be a case similar to the one I referred to a few minutes ago.

Mr. CARROLL: Has this Bill been before the Private Bills Committee?

Mr. REID: I do not think so. If it has not been before that committee, it should go there, and the evidence of the deputy minister should be taken to show that the facts as stated in the affidavit are correct.

The CHAIRMAN: The Bill is reported by the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills without any amendment. That statement on the face of the Bill is signed by Walter Todd, Clerk of the Private Bills Committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There must be some misunderstanding as to the matter. I would suggest that the committee report progress.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was going to suggest that.

Progress reported.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

EDMONTON OFFICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. DOUGLAS:

Is there an employee named Nice in the Interior Department at Edmonton?
2. If so, what are his duties?
3. What is his salary?
4. When was he appointed?

Mr. CROTHERS (for Mr. Roche): No.

RECRUITING AT NORTH BAY.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. What is the name of the recruiting officer at North Bay, Ontario, and what rate is he being paid?
2. What premises have been leased for his convenience in North Bay, what rental is being paid therefor, to whom is it being paid, and from what date?
3. Was an effort made to secure any other premises? If so, what were the rentals asked, and by whom?

Major General HUGHES:

1. No recruiting officer has been appointed at North Bay.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

FRENCH RIVER IMPROVEMENTS.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. How much work has been done on the French River improvements since January 1, 1913?
2. Who are the contractors for the work, and how much has been paid them?

Mr. ROGERS: 1. Construction of the Little Chaudière dam; rock excavation, camp equipment and surveys have cost $101,067.34.

2. Contractor Jennings & Ross have been paid $3,460 for work on the substructure of the Big Chaudière dam. The contract for superstructure has not yet been awarded.

COOKSHIRE POST OFFICE REPAIRS.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Have any repairs been done to the post office at Cookshire since 1911?
2. If so, by whom, at what price, and were tenders called for same?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, in September, 1912, the tender of Ayton Cromwell was accepted to dig drain, lay pipe, build parapet wall above roof, lay cement walk and platform, lay concrete floor in basement, paint wood work, etc., for $1,300 which was considered fair and reasonable by the Chief Architect. In October, 1912, repairs were made to the furnaces by George Bushey at a cost of $22. In September, 1913, additional radiators were installed and repairs made to the heating apparatus by Gauthier & Co., at a cost of $108.33. Quotations were received from other contractors, for the larger repairs, but were not so satisfactory.

VEZINA'S CORNERS POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has Mr. Alfred Coulumbe, postmaster at Vezina's Corners, been dismissed from the office?

2. If so, what reasons have been given for his dismissal?

3. Who was the complainant, and who recommended his dismissal??

4. Who has he been replaced by, and by whom recommended?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Yes, on the 13th January, 1914.

2. He was dismissed for political partisanship.

3. The matter was brought to the attention of the department by Dr. John Hayes, and an investigation having been held, the evidence showed that the postmaster had taken an active part in politics.

4. Mr. Joseph Groleau, on recommendation.

DREDGE PONTOONS IN NEW GLASGOW.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What was the cost of hauling the dredge pontoons in New Glasgow in the Department of Public Works in the years 1912, 1913 and 1914?

2. To whom was the money paid for this work in each of these years?

Mr. HAZEN: 1912: John Stewart—hauling out pontoons, $410.62; launching, $8.75; towing, launching, cleaning, etc., $541.28; extending launchways, scraping, painting, $541.04; total, $1,501.69.

1913: John Stewart, launching, $81.31; Daniel Chisholm, rent of land, $100; Gammon Weir, hauling up, painting, scraping and landing, $500; total, $681.31.

1914: Gammon & Weir—Hauling out pontoons; $200, hauling up, painting, scrapping and launching, $1,100. Daniel Chisholm; rent of land, $200. Picton Co., Con. Supply Co., towing, $130. SS. Hiawatha, $45. Total, $1,675.

MR. P. A. MOUSSEAU.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Since Mr. P. A. Mousseau ceased to be superintendent of construction for the Louisville post office, has he been in the employ of the Government?

2. If so, in what capacity?

3. What are his duties?

4. What salary is he paid?

Mr. ROGERS:

1, 2, 3. Yes, he has been temporarily employed, supervising construction of fire escapes and hand rails, and in purchasing and installing furniture, safe, etc.

4. $4 per day.

HAWKESBURY-GRENVILLE BRIDGE.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Has the Department of Public Works acquired from the Hawkesbury Lumber Company a right of way over their mill property in the town of Hawkesbury for the purpose of the proposed interprovincial bridge between Hawkesbury and Grenville?

2. If so, what was the amount of compensation paid?

3. If not, has the company offered to sell, and for what price?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. A right of way was expropriated.

2. Compensation has not been paid to the company.

3. The company has not made any offer to sell.

WAR SUPPLIES—OLIVER EQUIPMENT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many Oliver equipments were sent with the first contingent to England?

2. From whom were they bought, and what was paid for them?

3. Were they discarded in England as unnecessary or useless?

Major General HUGHES.

1. 13,920 sets Oliver pattern valise equipment.

2. The greater part of this equipment was taken from stock in ordnance stores, and prices and names of contractors for this portion are not now available. The balance of the equipment sent was bought from Messrs. H. Carson, Ltd., of Ottawa, and Adams Bros. Manufacturing Co., of Toronto, at $6.75 per set.

3. It is reported that the Oliver equipment was withdrawn, and the division completed with Web equipment from the British ordnance.

PORT DANIEL WEST MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Who is the contractor for the mail service between Port Daniel West post office and the railway station?

2. (a) When was the contract awarded, and (b) at what price?

3. Were any tenders called for? If not, why not?

4. Who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of their respective tenders?

5. Who was the previous contractor, and did he offer to renew his contract, and what price was paid him?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. E. Bisson.

2. (a) 15th March, 1911, the contract dated from 1st July, 1911. (b) 21 cents per trip, amounting to $131.46 per annum.

3. Yes.

4. Edmund Bisson, $131.46; William Bisson, $156.50; E. Saint Meux, $174.

5. W. Bisson. He was paid 16 cents per trip and did not offer to renew his contract.

MR. D. CARDIN.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE:

1. Is Mr. D. Cardin, of St. Anselme, county of Dorchester, in the employ of the Government as customs officer, or otherwise?
2. If so, what is his salary, and when was he appointed?
3. Where does he have his office, and what rent is paid by the Customs Department for that office?
4. What have been the revenues of that office for the past twelve months?

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.
2. $700 per year. First employed Nov. 14, 1913; permanently appointed Aug. 15, 1914.
3. In building owned by J. E. Audet; $12.50 per month.
4. $2,554.91.

EUGENE FUROIS.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Is Eugène Furois an employee of the Quebec post office?
2. If so, what is his employment, what salary does he receive, and by whom was he recommended?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. No; he is in the Inspector's office at Quebec.
2. First-class clerk, Grade B, at $1,500 a year. He was appointed on the recommendation of the late Postmaster General, on the 29th March, 1912.

MR. ANSELME JALBERT.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE:

1. Is Mr. Anselme Jalbert, labourer, of St. Anselme, in the employ of the Post Office Department at Montreal?
2. If so, what is his position, what salary has he, and what examination did he pass before appointment?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Yes.
2. Temporary helper; salary, $2 a day. He has not passed the Civil Service examination, as temporary employees are not required to do so.

MR. JOSEPH EDMOND AUDETTE.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE:

1. Is Mr. Joseph Edmond Audette, carter, of St. Anselme, county of Dorchester, employed by the Government as inspector of food-stuffs?
2. If so, what is his salary, and when was he appointed?
3. Did he pass any examination prior to appointment?
4. (a) How many reports has he made of the work done by himself, and (b) what are the dates of such reports?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. Yes.
2. $200 per annum; April 1, 1914.
3. None required.
4. (a) Six, on 173 samples collected; (b) June, September, October, November and December, 1914, January, 1915.

MODEL FARM, TOWNSHIP OF STANFOLD.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Does the Government intend to establish a model farm in the township of Stanfold?
2. If so, does the Government intend to purchase the farm belonging to Arthur Gilbert?
3. What is the price asked by Arthur Gilbert?
4. What is the size of that farm, and what is the quality of the soil?
5. Are there rocks and boulders on the land, and is it all under cultivation?

Mr. BURRELL: So far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned:

1 and 2. No.

3, 4 and 5. The department has no information.

WAR SUPPLIES.

Mr. OLIVER moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports or proceedings, and of all other documents relating to the purchase in Canada of horses for army service, by the British and French Governments respectively.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The documents relating to such matters, so far as we have knowledge of them, are of a confidential character. If the hon. gentleman will speak to me privately and will let me know just what information he requires, perhaps I shall be able to give it to him.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Ernest Lapointe: For a copy of all documents, papers, correspondence, reports, pay-lists, accounts, etc., relating to the work on the dam at the place known as Grande Décharge in lake St. John.

Mr. Ernest Lapointe: For a copy of all documents, letters, correspondence, messages, reports, etc., relating to the calls for tenders for the carrying of the mails between the post office at St. François de Montmagny and the Intercolonial station during the years 1914 and 1915, as well as a copy of the tenders that have been sent in relating to the said mail service.

Mr. Turriff: For a return showing the names of all the individuals, firms, companies and corporations to whom contracts have been given for supplies, by the Department of Militia and Defence, or by any other department of the Government, or by any parties acting on behalf of the Government since 1st August last.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 114, to amend the Adulteration Act.—Mr. Blondin.

Bill No. 116, to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—Mr. Blondin.

HOUSE OF COMMONS REPRESENTATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

CORRECTION OF CLERICAL ERRORS.

On the Order being called:

Third reading of Bill 106, to amend the Representation Act, 1914.—Sir Robert Borden.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed by the Minister of Justice, who has had charge of this Bill, that some very slight corrections are necessary, and as they can only be made in Committee of the Whole, I beg to move:

That the order for the third reading of Bill No. 106, to amend the Representation Act, 1914, be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1—Nipissing:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a suggestion, which I received this morning from British Columbia, that the name of the electoral district of Yale be changed to Okanagan. Section 12 of the Representation Act, 1914, is as follows:

The electoral district of Cariboo, comprising the provincial electoral districts of Cariboo, Lillooet, Kamloops and Yale excepting that portion of Yale contained in the electoral district of Westminster district, as the same is above described, and including the whole city, and district municipality of Salmon Arm.

The electoral division of Cariboo includes the provincial electoral district of Yale. Section 13 of the Act is as follows:

The electoral district of Yale, comprising the provincial electoral district of Okanagan, excepting any portion of the city or district municipality of Salmon Arm which may be contained therein, and the provincial electoral districts of Similkameen, Greenwood and Grand Forks.

The district of Okanagan is included in what is called Yale by our Act, and it is suggested that instead of being called Yale the district should be called Okanagan, to avoid confusion.

Mr. BURRELL: It is true that there is a provincial electoral district called Yale in what is now known as the northern riding of Cariboo, the constituency being formerly named Yale-Cariboo. It was thought by some of the people there to be undesirable to designate the new riding in the south by the name of any provincial constituency. The four provincial constituencies in the southern riding of the district of Yale are Okanagan, Similkameen, Greenwood and Grand Forks. The district of Yale still covers for judicial purposes the whole of that southern country, while Cariboo is associated more directly with the northern country, including the provincial riding of Yale. I have heard no complaints from the people there in this matter. Yale, which is an old historic name, embraces the whole southern judicial district, and I am inclined to think that the Minister of Public Works had these things in view when the matter was under consideration.

[Mr. Blondin.]

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Quebec East:

Mr. DOHERTY moved:

That section 4 be amended by inserting after the words "the village of Stadacona" in the last line thereof, the words "the territory which formerly constituted."

There is now no longer any village of Stadacona. What was formerly the village of Stadcona is included in Limoilou ward of the city of Quebec.

Motion agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 5—Quebec West:

Mr. DOHERTY moved:

That section 5 be amended by inserting the words "the territory which formerly included" before the words "the village of Stadacona," in lines 6 and 7.

Motion agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

The House again in committee, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair, on Bill No. 109, to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—Mr. Doherty.

On section 2—proof of right to be a petitioner:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What change does this make?

Mr. DOHERTY: The change made is the provision that the production of a copy of the voters' list used in the election containing the name of the petitioner shall be

conclusive evidence that the petitioner could lawfully present the petition.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is designed to prevent controversy as to the status of the petitioner, which sometimes causes delay. I should think it is a very proper amendment.

Mr. MARCIL: Do you require from the petitioner an affidavit that he is the person whose name appears on the voters' list?

Mr. DOHERTY: The production of a voters' list certified by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to be a true copy, containing the name of the person presenting the petition, is conclusive evidence as to his status. There is no requirement of an affidavit by him if his name is on the voters' list. It may be that under that provision the court would consider it necessary for the petitioner to prove that he was the same man whose name appeared on the list.

Mr. MARCIL: The point is important because, for instance, in my constituency there are many men of exactly the same name who would have to go back to the third or fourth generation to be identified. There might be a dozen Jean Antoines in my constituency.

Mr. DOHERTY: My impression is that the court would require proof to be made before it that the petitioner was the man whose name appeared on the voters' list. That would be a better protection than merely making an affidavit.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Does my hon. friend know if the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is bound to give a certified copy of the voters' list to anybody who asks for it, say by letter?

12 noon.

Mr. BENNETT: It might be well to put in a line, "who, upon request, shall supply the same."

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Where a public official is authorized to do a particular act, the court considers him as being under the duty to perform that particular act. Therefore, if he has power to certify a list, it would be his duty to certify a list when called upon to do so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Under this Bill any party may ask the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for a copy of the list. I should imagine that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery would be bound to give a copy to anybody asking for it the moment the request was made.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was endeavouring to meet the point the hon. gentleman has made. If the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is authorized to deliver a certified copy of a document, of which he is the legal custodian, it seems to me to follow as a matter of course that it is his duty to furnish this certified list when so required. While I have no objection to inserting any words to make that plain, I do not think they are really necessary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Neither do I; I assume that is understood.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, I would suggest that after the word "petitioner" in the second line of subsection 2 words should be inserted in order to make it read:

> The production of the voters' list containing the name of the petitioner, as set forth in the petition or of a copy thereof certified—

Mr. PARDEE: Should it not be absolutely mandatory on the part of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to deliver this certified copy of the voters' list fortwith? If a petition should be filed, and if the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery should refuse to deliver the certified copy of the list, the object of the petitioner might be defeated because the time for taking proceedings might expire.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The only objection is that, if you make a special provision in this case that he has to deliver a certified copy, it might alter the law in other cases. If there is to be any provision, it should be a general provision that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is bound to furnish copies of all documents of which he is the lawful custodian. I do not think it is necessary, because, without any special provision, I understand that is his duty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I assume that it is the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. If I am a petitioner in a case and I want a copy of that list he is bound to deliver it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, that is my understanding of it.

Mr. PARDEE: Would it not be well to provide that a copy of the voters' list " shall forthwith be delivered by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery?" Although the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is bound to deliver the list on demand, yet should

he not do so, does it not strike the right hon. the leader of the Government that there should be something further in the Act to compel him forthwith, upon application for a certified copy, to deliver the same to whomever might apply for it? It would appear to me that that ought to be done.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really do not think there is any danger, but might I suggest a change that would place the matter beyond question? Suppose the section should read in this way:

> The production of the voters'list containing the name of the petitioner, as set forth in the petition, or of a copy thereof, certified by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to be a true copy of the voters' list used at the election in the electoral district to which the petitioner relates shall be conclusive evidence that the petitioner could lawfully present the petition.

Then you have the opportunity of bringing the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery there with the voters' list, or on the other hand you have the opportunity to get a certified copy, and if you run any danger in one way certainly any court upon his default in furnishing a copy would order him to produce the voters' list. I therefore beg to move that:

> Section 2 be amended by adding in the second line, between the words "petition and "certified," the following words: "or of a copy thereof" and striking out the words, "or of a copy thereof" where they were inserted before.

Mr. DOHERTY: The fact that you call for a copy of the voters' list would not exclude the production of the original. There is no harm in making it perfectly clear that you permit the production of the voters' list.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the amendment make it clear as to who is to produce the voters' list? What is the alternative?

Mr. DOHERTY: It would certainly be for the petitioner to produce proof of his qualification, and if he wanted to produce the original it would be open to him to ask the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to appear and produce it.

Mr. MURPHY: I gathered from the remarks of the right hon. the Prime Minister that it was in his mind that the effect of the amendment was that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was to perform one of two duties—either to appear in person and produce the voters' list or to furnish a certified copy of it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought the amendment proposed by my hon. friend

the Minister of Justice was amply sufficient. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side had some doubt about it. Therefore, I proposed my amendment with a view of giving the petitioner the right to have the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery either to go through with the original list or produce a copy certified by him to be a true copy. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) had some doubt as to the absolute duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to furnish such certified copy. I have no doubt, but in order to put the matter beyond question, it seems to me that the amendment that I proposed will meet every possible contingency that could be suggested.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 3—sections 6 and 7 repealed:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the object of the repeal of these sections?

Mr. DOHERTY: Section 6 required the production of an affidavit by the petitioner that he has good reason to believe, and verily believes, that certain allegations contained in the petition are true and it also required that if any other person was substituted for the petitioner the person so substituted should make an affidavit to the same effect. Section 7 provided for preliminary objection by the sitting member. The purpose of this amendment is to do away with what appear to be unnecessary formalities that only encumber the proceedings and which have been a prolific source of delay in the past.

On section 4—form of petition:

Mr. DOHERTY: The object of this section is to give the respondent the protection of requiring that the party complaining should set forth the grounds of his complaint with sufficient particularity. The law, as it now stands, permits the petitioners to set forth in the most absolute general terms charges of violation of every section of the statute, and the practice, as I understand it, has been to recite the statute and make the preliminary allegation that the respondent has violated all of its provisions. That was considered by the committee to be absolutely unfair towards the respondent. On the other hand, it seems perfectly proper that where a man takes the responsibility of making charges of grave violation of a law so important as this, he should not be allowed to rush into court unless he knows substantially what it is which he wants to charge the respondent with. It

was considered only a matter of fairness that the respondent should have before him sufficient particulars to enable him to substantially know and answer the charges that are brought against him. Furthermore, it is considered that this amendment would contribute materially to making it possible to expedite the trial.

Mr. GERMAN: Under the law as it is at present, the petitioner is obliged to give particulars after he has filed his petition, and he has to prove the petition or to pay costs. What more can you do by this change?

Mr. DOHERTY: This says to the petitioner at the outset that he shall tell the respondent what he complains of, so that the respondent can properly meet the charges, and so that there can be a prompt trial.

Mr. GERMAN: It will be a change theoretically but not practically.

Mr. DOHERTY: It will make a very material and practical change. It may be open to discussion whether it is a desirable change. I myself think it is highly desirable, but there is no question about it being a material change. The court, with the issue before it from the outset, can fix the trial within a limited period, whereas, as it is now, months and even years elapse, and the petitioner then comes in with particulars that he has dug up in these years to try to support his petition. The considerations which moved the committee to suggest this amendment were, that in the first place it was a matter of ordinary fairness to the respondent, and that in the second place it afforded a means of expediting the trial, which is the great object of this legislation. It seemed to the committee that there is ample law now, but that the principal difficulty was the proper method of promptly enforcing the law. It seemed to us that this amendment is absolutely essential, if we are going to attain the object of a speedy trial, which we have in view.

Mr. PROULX: Would the petitioner be barred from going outside the specified charges made in the petition?

Mr. DOHERTY: The purpose is that a man should get as fair an opportunity to make a defence as he gets in an ordinary action before the courts. It will be for the court to determine whether the particular petition is sufficiently particularized to meet the purpose. The intention of the amendment is to prevent surprise and unnecessary expense to the respondents, and to assure a fair and speedy trial. I should think it would be within the power of the court to make rules, under which further particulars may be ordered, if asked for. I would take it that the court would not allow a petitioner to proceed to prove allegations which are not particularized, to the extent required by the present law.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am very much afraid that instead of leading to a speedy trial and having the member who is elected by corrupt practices unseated, the section is going to give him a splendid opportunity to avail himself of technicalities and to delay the trial for a long time, or probably to have the petition thrown out. It says:

> The petition presented under this Act may be in form "A" in the schedule of this Act. It must complain of the undue election or return of a member, or that no return has been made, or that a double return has been made or of a matter contained in any special return made, or of some unlawful or corrupt act or acts, and shall contain such particulars of the complaint set out in the petition as may be necessary to prevent surprise or unnecessary expense to the respondent and to insure a fair and effectual trial; and it must be signed by the petitioner, or all the petitioners if there are more than one.

Who is to determine as to whether there are sufficient particulars to prevent surprise, and what should happen if the judge should think there are not sufficient particulars? In an election petition you cannot set out the offence with particularity. The offence is usually committed in secret, and while the petitioner and his friends may see corrupt practices all around them, they could not within the time fixed set them out with particularity. But it is difficult to give particulars with exactness, and one cannot do it in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. It is only by making general allegations and relying upon the evidence that one can contest an election. If you require particulars given in such a manner as will appeal to the judgment of the judge and allow him very great discretion, my impression is that in a great many cases petitions which may be founded upon justice will be defeated entirely by reason of the requirements of this section.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think I understand clearly what the committee had in mind in framing this section. It would be

quite possible that it would work out in the way in which they expected. As my hon. friend knows, the difficulty with petitions in the past has been that, notwithstanding the provision as to the necessity of an affidavit, the practice has always been that the solicitor framing the petition takes practically every section of the Dominion Elections Act and alleges in the terms of those sections that its provisions have been violated by the respondent. In fact, the petition ordinarily has given no more information to the respondent than if the petitioner had said in a few words that the respondent had violated every section of the Dominion Elections Act, and had let it go at that. I remember many years ago arguing before the Supreme Court that a petition in that form was not in compliance with the Dominion Controverted Elections Act. The court reserved judgment upon the appeal; but as it appeared that the petition was in the form that had been ordinarily adopted in the province of Nova Scotia, the court held that it was in compliance with the Act. That judgment was delivered by the late Mr. Justice King. I suppose it was the intention of the committee to make it necessary that there should be some more definite statement than that which is embodied in the mere assertion that every section of the Dominion Elections Act has been controverted. I do not know the precise idea of the committee, but I suppose that in view of the abolition of the affidavit which hitherto has been required they have thought it desirable that some more definite statement of the grounds upon which the petition is presented should be set forth therein. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has raised a difficulty which of course strikes one immediately, that is to say, the extent of the particulars made necessary by this amendment, and he desires to know how that will be determined. I suppose that would be a question for the court or for the judge trying the petition to determine. For that purpose it would be necessary for him to construe the Act and the amendment and to come to a conclusion in regard to the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is what I had in mind—that the man, say John Jones, must be named, and that the particulars must be given of the corrupt act which was committed; that is, that so-and-so was driven to the poll, the name being given. If on the trial the petitioner should fail to prove

[Sir Robert Borden.]

that particular act, the petition would be thrown out.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Although I may be in error, I do not quite understand that the committee intend by this amendment to necessitate the giving of particulars of the character which are required before the trial begins. The practice, as we all know, is that when a case is to be set down for trial, the respondent comes with a motion asking that particulars shall be given before a certain day in order that he may prepare his defence. I would not suppose it was the intention of the committee that particulars of that character should be set out in the petition.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is what section 5 says.

Mr. DOHERTY: You are to give such particulars as are required by section 11. The court will have to determine in each case the extent of the particulars required to prevent surprise and to ensure a fair and effectual trial. The section does not say that the petitioner shall give the name in every instance. There are circumstances where, perhaps, the name may be necessary to prevent surprise and ensure a fair and effectual trial; there are circumstances where it will not be necessary. The court will appreciate that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In regard to the form, section 3 of schedule A says:

Here state the grounds on which the petitioner relies, and, in case illegal or corrupt acts are alleged, the particulars of each of such acts as prescribed by section 11.

Surely that must mean the particular person who has been bribed, or the particular person who has been brought to the poll.

Mr. DOHERTY: It says the particulars as prescribed by section 11.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Of each of such acts.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. What particulars are prescribed by section 11? That the petitioner shall give sufficient particulars to prevent surprise and ensure a fair and effectual trial. The judge will determine that point. He may determine it upon a motion for further particulars, if the respondent chooses to take that course. If the respondent chooses to meet the petition and go to trial, then it will be for the judge, when evidence of a particular thing is offered, to determine whether proof of that particular action would under the petition as drafted be a surprise to the respondent—

something which he would not be called upon to expect—and would prevent there being a fair trial. I do not dispute that the enactment of this provision may prevent the making of a certain number of petitions. The situation to-day, as I think the hon. member for St. John correctly describes it, is that, because people think there is corruption in the air, because they think there was a great deal of corruption, although they do not actually know that there was any, and because the law requires the petition to be filed within forty days, they put in their petition with nothing that one can call knowledge of corrupt acts. Let the law be honest with itself and the people to whom it applies. If the law means as it says, that you must file your petition within forty days, surely it does not mean to say: On condition that on a petition when you know nothing, we shall give you a year or two years to hunt up and find whether you can discover anything. If that is the state of the law, then we ought to repeal that law and say that a man may, whenever he finds out any corruption at any time within the Parliament for which a member is elected, bring in a petition. I believe that the law as it stands to-day is, on the face of it, an invitation—I do not want to say to perjury—but to the very loosest kind of swearing. Requiring an affidavit has proven absolutely nugatory as a protection for the innocent respondent—and there are some innocent respondents. The other evening we were seriously attacked because it was said we were throwing every member of Parliament to the wolves and facilitating his being unseated.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You are certainly taking him from the wolves by this section.

Mr. DOHERTY: We are trying to create a situation different from that which exists under the law to-day. To-day a man is an object of suspicion and prima facie guilty of every sort of corruption. And why? Because he has allowed himself to be nominated for Parliament and a majority of the voters, apparently at all events, have voted for him. And yet this law, apparently so severe against candidates, affords such opportunities for delay that the one thing manifest under our system is that you can sit through a whole Parliament in the face of a protestation, whether you are innocent or whether you are guilty. If under the provisions proposed a few guilty men escape being petitioned against, and yet, on the other hand those petitioned against are brought to a speedy trial, and the result is actually attained of convicting those who deserve to be convicted, the amendment will be a good thing. Looking at it from the point of view of enforcement of the law, I think it is worth while to create conditions which shall assure the respondent that his case will be tried out promptly, and to actually secure prompt trial in a certain number of cases even though the law should operate to prevent the institution of a certain number of petitions upon which the petitioner gets a year or two to prove that the respondent, or somebody on his behalf, had hired a couple of cabs. As I say, the conception of the committee was that the great thing to be desired was that where there was actual guilt there should be prompt trial and also that measures should be enacted to prevent people, by collusion or combination, spinning out the contestation for a long period of time. It will be seen by the sections that follow that within fifteen days after service of that petition the respondent may file his answer, a copy of which is to be served upon the petitioner. Then, after a short delay, the parties ask for fixing the trial, and the court shall fix the time. If the parties do not so ask, then the court itself on the clerk's application shall fix the time. If the parties do not go on at that time, that will end the trial. So, every man will have to understand that in making a contestation, he has entered upon something which he must see through promptly if he is to secure his rights. To achieve that end, the respondent must be given notice promptly of what he is to meet, and it must be given in such form as will avoid surprise and ensure a fair trial. This is a point which the courts have to decide in a large number of cases. Under the election law as it stands the bill of particulars must be put in, and if the party objects that the allegations are not sufficiently particular or definite, the court must decide the point.

Mr. MACDONALD: If the court decides that the statement in the information is too vague, can the court void the proceedings upon that?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no provision here for a preliminary objection. As I understand it, this is the way the law would work out now—

Mr. MACDONALD: But could the respondent move to set aside the petition on account of the delay involved?

Mr. DOHERTY: To my mind he would not need to do that. The respondent asks for particulars. The court, let us say, decides that he is entitled to them. The petitioner does not give them. Then the court would naturally dismiss the petition. But suppose that the respondent says the charges are not particularized sufficiently to prevent surprise and secure a fair trial, and the court decides that the particulars in the petition are sufficient, then the case will go on. If the court is of opinion that the particulars are not sufficient, it may well refuse the evidence.

Mr. GERMAN: Does the minister intend that the matters included in the petition shall be the only matters intended for trial?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. GERMAN: Then, he must put a clause in this Bill forbidding the court to allow it to go further. Because these gentlemen who are put upon the Bench become exceedingly virtuous—though they may have been politicians before—and they will go far beyond what the minister expects and will allow the amendment of the petition until the trial comes on. That is the experience of every one of us. The petitioner comes forward and says: We have found new cases of corruption; broad, wide, strong cases; and we want to have an opportunity to prove them and to that end we wish to amend our petition. The court will allow that unless you put it into this Bill that they shall not allow it. And if you put that in the Bill you practically prevent petitions, for you cannot get the particulars of corruption in forty days as a rule, particularly against the shrewd politicians of the West.

Mr. DOHERTY: There might still be a fairly wide field of operation. There is no doubt that it is intended that the action shall set forth the causes upon which it rests.

Mr. GERMAN: And the court is supposed to stop at that?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think it is the habit of courts to allow amendments for the purpose of setting forth distinct new causes of action. In order that there shall be an "amendment" there must be something "amended." It does not "amend" a cause of action, to bring in a new cause of action. And you have to remember that we have here a law—and personally I do not think it is an objectionable law—which provides that these proceedings must be instituted within forty days. I hardly think that any court would conceive it to be within its rights or within its power of amendment to allow a party to come in and allege some absolutely new cause of action, any right of action based upon which is actually extinguished by prescription. I cannot conceive that a court would say to a petitioner: I am going to allow you to come in a year after the election and make your petition all over again, basing it on a new cause of action, though the law says that your petition should have been brought within forty days. I quite conceive that the courts may exercise much latitude with regard to amending things that are alleged, but I do not apprehend that they would allow the petition to be entirely remade or an entirely new cause to be alleged. I think that, at the very least, we can wait until the apprehensions of the hon. member in that regard have been justified by the results of the operation of this Act.

Mr. GERMAN: There would not be many petitions filed under the Controverted Elections Act if this were decided by the law.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think it would be better to have fewer petitions and more judgments. I think one may fairly say—let the blame be generally shared—that the large number of petitions, when we have contrasted with the number of judgments, when we do have any judgments at all, is in the nature of a public scandal, and is the best justification for trying to bring the law into a condition where a man will only be enabled to make a petition when he has distinct and concrete grounds for doing so.

Mr. FOWLER: Why should the hon. minister assume that the large number of persons charged with these election offences are guilty?

Mr. DOHERTY: I did not say the number of convictions; I said the number of judgments or decisions, favourable or unfavourable. What I point out as being the scandal is not that the persons against whom petitions are made are necessarily guilty, but that when we do have a large number of petitions we do have almost no decisions, in one sense or the other. When a petition is made it should imply that the man who makes it has some grounds for doing so. When the petition and the grounds upon which it is made are put forth, we should provide, as we endeavour to provide by the following sections, that

a trial shall be brought on, and that if the parties will not bring on a trial, that shall be the end of the petition.

Mr. PROULX: Suppose that at the trial the respondent objects that the particulars given by the petitioner are insufficient, will the court have power to adjourn the hearing of the petition in order to enable the petitioner to give fuller particulars?

Mr. DOHERTY: That brings up a very large and very wide question. We are proposing now to make a law, and that law will, of course, have to be applied by the courts in accordance with the general rule that governs the power of the courts to allow an amendment of the petition or to allow an adjournment. The only answer that I can give is that the court would determine, according to the circumstances put before it, whether the justice of the case required that that should be done. The hon. gentleman has really asked me to place myself in the position of the court and to give one judgment to be applied to all possible cases; that I would not venture to do. It seems to me that the court would, in each particular case, have to determine whether the justice of the case required that the court should permit the adjournment, or permit, possibly, an amendment within the limits which I have just endeavoured to indicate to the hon. member for Welland. There would be cases, I presume, in which the court would think that while it would be a fair thing to give the defendant a more clear definition of what was to be anticipated, at the same time it could not properly be said the defendant was absolutely taken by surprise and that a fair trial was prevented by reason of the vagueness of the allegations of the petition. The necessity for determination of the result of this provision would arise accordingly as a petitioner offered evidence of particular acts on which he based his petition. The respondent would naturally, I suppose, if he saw any ground for it, urge that what was sought to be proved was not sufficiently particularized to lead him to expect evidence of facts of that kind.

Mr. PARDEE: Let us suppose that in the petition, bribery, impersonation, treating, and so on, are alleged. Was it the opinion of the committee that it would be sufficient for the petition to state that one or more of these things had been illegally committed by the candidate or his agent, or would it be necessary to say that the candidate or his agent treated John Brown or bribed William Smith, and so on? Would it be sufficient to make the general charge, as was formerly done in election petitions?

Mr. DOHERTY: In my judgment, the general charge of bribery would certainly not be sufficient. How far you would have to go in the matter of giving particulars would depend largely on the circumstances of each case. I do not think that you could lay it down as a general rule that because I am required by law sufficiently to particularize in order to prevent surprise, that necessarily means that I must name each particular voter to whom I allege that bribes were offered.

Mr. PARDEE: Why this change?

Mr. DOHERTY: This change is to provide that when I allege bribery, I shall give such circumstances surrounding it as in the judgment of the judge will prepare the respondent fairly to meet evidence of the facts as that evidence is offered to the court.

Mr. PARDEE: Only of specific facts under the petition.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. PARDEE: No others could go in.

Mr. DOHERTY: No others could go in, certainly. It is the ordinary rule, as I understand it, of every legal proceeding, that you are entitled to prove what you have alleged, and what you have alleged with sufficient particularity to enable your defendant, the man against whom you make your allegations, to go to the court called upon to expect proof of matters of that kind. But it certainly does not imply that in every case you must give the name of the man bribed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Or the man who gave the bribe.

Mr. DOHERTY: Or the man who gave the bribe. To ask any man to stand up here and lay down a general rule saying what are sufficient particulars to enable a man not to be taken by surprise and to have a fair trial, is asking the impossible. But I may say that for a great number of years, day after day, I have heard men determining that question in particular cases and determining it, as it seemed to me, reasonably and fairly to both parties. I have heard instances where it was considered that names of people were necessary and others where it was not. In my own province we have worked out a perfectly rational method of dealing with these questions, still comply-

ing with the elementary rule that a man must state the grounds of his complaint with sufficient particularity to enable another man to have a fair trial upon it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It might be wise, however, to go back to the old section, inasmuch as we have provided for facilitating the trial, that is in connection with the present provisions of the Act. Perhaps there would not be any great objection to restoring the old clause.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: You cannot do that if you stick to the first clause, that there is conclusive evidence.

At one o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock, Mr. Sevigny in the chair.

On section 4—form of petition:

Mr. DOHERTY: It occurred to me that after the discussion on section 4, and having regard to the somewhat sharp division of opinion in regard to it, possibly it would not be an unwise course that we should let this section stand in the meantime and go on with the other sections of the Bill. I think that further examination may throw some light on this section. The same thing will really apply to section 5, as section 5 merely makes for a cross petition the same provision that section 4 makes for the petition itself. The questions involved would be substantially the same.

Sections 4 and 5 stand.

On section 6—how security deposit shall be made:

Mr. PROULX: Why would not an accepted cheque on a chartered bank be accepted as it would be accepted for the deposit in an election?

Mr. DOHERTY: The difference that is made by this amendment is to substitute the permissive for the imperative form that was contained in that section as it stood, and then, that being done and combining the effect of that with the effect of the next following clause, which I would ask my hon. friend to read, it produces the result that the receipt of the clerk of the court is made conclusive. He is permitted to accept the deposit in the different methods specified but his receipt is conclusive in any event as to the making of the deposit and as to its sufficiency. The hon. gentleman suggests the acceptance of an accepted cheque and there might be something to be said pro and con in that regard but at all events if the officer gave the receipt that the deposit had been made when he was merely taking an accepted cheque, although he would not be taking what is permitted to be taken, it would be conclusive, he having taken the responsibility. Whether the Act should expressly include an accepted cheque is perhaps open to some question because you may reduce it down then to the mere matter of a man being able to arrange with a bank to get a cheque accepted where he does not actually have the money. It might be that the party against whom the proceedings are undertaken would have the responsibility of the bank but there are some advantages in not expressly permitting a method that involves anything except the actual money.

Mr. PROULX: I thought it would be more convenient to submit an accepted cheque than the money. In Ontario we have to enter the protest with the registrar of the Court of Appeal in Toronto and we have to send the money there.

On section 9—sections 17, 18, 19 and 20 repealed; service and preliminary objections:

Mr. MACDONALD: With reference to section 19 providing that within fifteen days after service of a petition, the respondent may file with the clerk of the court a written answer to the petition, I would say that this clause is very general in regard to the nature of the answer to be filed. Is there any special provision giving to the judges power to make regulations as to the nature of the answer or as to what shall be deemed a sufficient answer? Suppose an answer was not sufficiently definite, or suppose counsel for petitioners said: This is no answer at all, it is not a denial with sufficient particularity of the acts which are alleged. They might say that the denial is too indefinite just as the answers in civil cases are frequently ruled out where counsel on the other side attack the pleadings on account of their not complying with some precedent which it is necessary they should comply with. What is the standard as to what a sufficient answer would be?

Mr. DOHERTY: The provision here is permissive to the party attacked to file a written answer if deemed proper. Assuming the clauses which stand to have been adopted, it would be open, as I understand it, to the respondent in a written answer to raise any question that he thought it was desirable to raise whether as to the suffi-

ciency of the proceedings or the actual truth of the statements of fact. He is by this section permitted to file an answer and no restriction is placed upon the ground which he may invoke as against the petition, the idea of the Act being to reduce the whole thing to one trial. My hon. friend will observe that in the following section. 19a, the provision is that:

After the expiration of fifteen days after the service of the petition, whether an answer is filed or served or not, the petition shall be held at issue and the court may at any time thereafter, upon the application of either party, fix some convenient time and place for the trial of the petition.

Taking the two sections together, the purpose and effect is that within fifteen days it shall be optional with the party attacked to file such written answers as he may desire to the petition thus filed. Failing his doing that, it shall be assumed that issue is joined generally upon the petition. Assuming that the respondent wants to rest upon the ground of the insufficiency of the petition itself, either as not setting up something that amounts to an offence or as not sufficiently particularizing, he would be, as I understand it, at liberty to raise these grounds in that answer without prejudice to his making an answer also upon the statement of alleged facts as made in the petition. The idea is to reduce it down so that upon all the matters that may be raised there shall be just one trial, and that that trial shall be as expeditious as possible.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then there is no advantage in the respondent filing an answer for any purpose whatever, because he would have available to him at the trial all matters of defence which he might assert whether he files an answer or not. His objections as to the insufficiency of the petition or any irregularities can be raised at the trial to the same effect, whether he has filed an answer or whether he has not.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think that would be the practical result, but we give him the option if he sees any advantage in it.

Mr. PROULX: I suppose in his answer he could admit some of the allegations of the petition, and if he did the petitioner need not bring his witnesses to court.

Mr. DOHERTY: He could make admissions if he chose. We have a provision of the law later dealing with the effect of admissions when they are made.

Mr. MORPHY: Do I understand the effect of the answer of the minister to be that, where a man did not answer, he could at the trial set out anything he might set out upon the preliminary objections?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, because under this Act there is no provision made for the preliminary objections.

Mr. MORPHY: It seems to me that this legislation will have the effect of bringing into play a series of objections at the trial, when the judges on the rota are there to hear the action, when probably one hundred witnesses are gathered, and when possibly counsel may be brought from a distance, so that we are out of the frying-pan into the fire. The air will not be cleared by preliminary objections, and the expense will be enormous of having to fight out at the trial what otherwise would have been settled on a chamber application. This would possibly cause witnesses and counsel and judges to be detained from day to day. The value of this change looks to me to be very doubtful.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no doubt there might be a situation, under certain circumstances, in which the inconveniences which the hon. gentleman suggests might arise. But what we are to ask ourselves is, whether the danger of that and the inconveniences which might result in some cases from that, are greater or less than the undesirable consequences which experience has demonstrated to result from the present provisions of the law, which expressly provide for the making of preliminary exceptions. I might point out that where the party would feel that he had statutory grounds to meet the petition, grounds of insufficiency in one respect or another, he might, in the exercise of his own judgment, make up his mind to rely upon that and avoid the necessity of bringing witnesses, or, the court might order an adjournment. I fancy that is a power which the court would probably feel justified in exercising, in the event of objections in the nature of preliminary objections being taken, which have upon their face the appearance of substantiality sufficient to justify the party who raised them seriously relying upon them. The court might, under these circumstances, if it considered that justice required it, order adjournment to more sufficiently deal with the matter on its merits. We have to rely upon the court for that. As to the expense which the petitioner might go to in bringing witnesses who might prove useless because the peti-

tion failed upon some ground of objection as to its sufficiency, it is true that would be an unfortunate thing for him, but it was for him to see to it that he made a sufficient petition. If the court determines it is not entitled to go into the merits of the case because of insufficiency, then what the petitioner suffers is the result of his own fault. No doubt, if we could obviate the substantial failures of justice which have resulted from the system of providing specially for preliminary objections, and also avoid the possibility of the suggested inconveniences that would be the better system. The members of the committee were not blind to the inconveniences which have been suggested, but they considered that the number of cases in which these inconveniences would arise, and the gravity of these inconveniences even assuming that they did arise, did not compensate for the very serious obstacles towards doing substantial justice which practice has proved to result from the system under which provision is specially made for the making of preliminary objections and of special trials on these objections.

On new section 20—notice of admission:

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does that give the court power to say it will not hear witnesses? I would be somewhat reluctant to give the court that power, because with the highest respect for the judiciary, I think there are some judges who would be very glad to exercise it, and who would refuse to hear witnesses.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They have that power now.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think there have been occasions when the courts have decided that once they have before them, by admission or otherwise, sufficient evidence to justify a judgment maintaining the petition, they have even questioned whether they have any right to go on and make further inquiries. The purpose of this section is not to extend any power on the part of the court to curtail evidence, but to make it quite clear that, notwithstanding the making of admissions, the court may decline to adjudicate simply upon the record constituted by the allegations and the admissions, and may require further inquiry. The purpose is to make it perfectly clear that the court shall have jurisdiction to go on to further inquiries, although the matter before it would justify a judgment.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is another phase of the situation to be considered. Suppose a party comes in and admits bribery by agents or some other contravention of the law which would make the election void, and the petitioner says, "I am perfectly satisfied;" all that is wanted is the determination of the court upon the matter, so that the costs may be apportioned. Suppose the court decides to go on, can it impose costs upon the unfortunate petitioner, if the result of the further inquiry should be valueless?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The question of costs is dealt with.

Mr. MACDONALD: I know that the respondent is not liable for costs if he files the admissions. What I am pointing out is this: supposing the judges should take it into their heads to go on and say: "We are going to have a roving commission," such as my hon. friend from St. John suggests, and supposing the petitioner says: "I am satisfied with the acknowledgement of the respondent," it is questionable whether under this Bill it should be left in the hands of judges further to impose costs upon a petitioner if no particular advantage is to be gained by that inquiry.

Mr. DOHERTY: So far as the respondent is concerned, if he has made admissions under the first paragraph of section 20, and if any evidence is taken in regard to the matters admitted he shall not be held liable for any costs incurred on account of that evidence, unless the result is to produce a conviction against himself of some corrupt act, in which case the court has power to order him to pay costs. As regards the petitioner who says that he is satisfied and will not proceed, we have no special provision in this Bill with regard to the costs; but I might point out, as I said a moment ago in answer to the hon. member for St. John, that the purpose of this enactment is to make it perfectly clear that the court has jurisdiction to go on, notwithstanding admissions sufficient to justify the maintenance of the petition. As regards the case where both the petitioner and the respondent decline to provide any further material upon which the court can go on, we gave a good deal of consideration to the question whether we should provide machinery by which the court could further go on, and, after a great deal of consideration and of different suggestions, we did not find that we could work out any practical method of doing that. So that I think the effect of this section in practice, as in

its intention, goes really no further than to make it quite clear that, notwithstanding there being sufficient upon the record, the courts ought to have jurisdiction to go on with a further inquiry. In order that that should be effectually carried out in practice, it would be necessary that one of the parties should concern himself with having it carried out.

Mr. MACDONALD: This question of amending the Controverted Dominion Elections Act along the line of preparing for an independent investigation into all the circumstances surrounding a particular election has been under consideration on previous occasions. I recall some years ago, when I was a young member of this House, that a special committee considered the question of providing for the appointment of an independent tribunal to hold an investigation in any event at the request of a certain number of people in the constituency.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: A public prosecutor.

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes, something of that kind. We must not forget the power of dealing with controverted elections by the judiciary of this country is a power delegated by this House. Not a great number of years ago both in England and Canada the task of determining the validity of an election of a member to the House was a matter to be determined by a committee of the House. We determined to commit that task to the judiciary, and we have followed that course so far. The task which the judge assumed was the task of reporting to the Speaker of the House whether or not the validity of the election of a certain hon. member which had been called in question had been determined in one way or the other. The giving of this extra jurisdiction to the judge, over and above the determination of the simple issue whether or not a member has been validly returned, opens the door to pretty wide responsibility, as suggested by my hon. friend. It seems to me that the Bill should go further and provide for some person assuming the responsibility, because the man who may be a petitioner against any hon. member may have only one object in view, that is, the unseating of the hon. member. Once his task is fulfilled, that is all he is interested in, and we can well conceive of cases in which a petitioner through his counsel will intimate to the judge that he is perfectly satisfied. We all know the developments of human nature in regard to these matters, and we cannot eliminate the human element in considering the way in which these things work out. If the judges are to have power over and above the attitude of either of the contesting parties to hold an independent investigation, there ought to be some rule to limit that power.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: It is limited to the allegations to the judge.

Mr. DOHERTY: As my hon. friend says, it is limited to the allegations before the judge, and moreover it is well to bear in mind that the petitioner, when he institutes the proceeding, although he may set it in motion for reasons of his own, for example, perhaps, to bring it to a particular end, sets in motion a proceeding in which at least the people of the constituency concerned have a direct and material interest. He is so little the master of the proceeding that under conditions already existing, if he drops it, some one else may come in and take it up. He has set on foot a proceeding in which the general public are interested, and he has done so because he has taken the responsibility of alleging certain things to be facts. I do not think he has any very serious ground of complaint if at the time he says, I do not want to go on any more, the court says to him: But you have undertaken to make these very serious statements which the public is interested in having cleared up. You have got the court here, you have got the respondent here, you have the proceedings in motion; and I, the court, am not going to shut my eyes to these things; if these things are true—and you have taken the responsibility of saying that they are true—then it is important that their truth should be established. I do not see what ground of complaint a petitioner could have that he is not allowed to take into his own hands absolutely the extent to which this inquiry, in which the whole public is interested, shall be carried. He might complain if it were suggested that the judge should go outside the things he, the petitioner, has alleged; but so long as the judge keeps himself, as he is bound to do within the things alleged, I cannot see that the petitioner has any serious ground of complaint.

I think I ought to add to the observation I made a few moments ago. I did not quite accurately describe the effect of the section. It is not so absolutely restricted as my expression would convey. As will be noticed power is given to require the summoning of such witnesses, the taking

of such evidence and the production of such papers as to the court may seem requisite or desirable. If the petitioner has taken the responsibility of making the most grave accusations, I think there should be power such as is given under this section to go into the matter even to the extent provided for. I do not think it unfair or unjust to the petitioner that if the court deems the matters as brought before it sufficiently serious for carefuly inquiry, those matters should be gone into.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then the minister ought to add some supplementary words empowering the court to make direction as to the distribution of the costs of the proceedings, otherwise how is the matter to be determined? Suppose the additional inquiry be futile, ought the costs of it to fall upon the petitioner?

Mr. DOHERTY: There would be power to deal with that as with the question of costs generally. If the result shows that the respondent is guilty of other corrupt acts than those admitted, that fact would naturally be a determining factor in the question of costs. But if the result is that the petitioner fails to make good his statements—which I assume to be serious, because the court would not investigate other than serious statements—I think there would be no injustice if the court laid the costs upon him. That is a power, which, I have no doubt, judges will exercise with great discretion. The real purpose, as I have said, is to put it within the power of the court, where facts are alleged and are apparently being suppressed, to inquire into those matters.

On section 10:

Section 22 is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

"2. If at any time, upon an ex parte application of either the petitioner or the respondent, it appears to the court that, in the interests of justice, it is desirable that the examination of any witness should be proceeded with forthwith, the court may grant an order for the examination of such witness, and the provisions of sections twenty-three, to thirty, both inclusive, shall, so far as applicable, apply to such witness, his examination and evidence."

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This is a very wide expression. Does this provide for cases of absence?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, possibly cases of absence. There are special considerations, it seemed to the committee, which justified giving the court a wide power for the examination of witnesses. What we have in mind is to make a provision under which it would be possible for the court to order the immediate examination of any person believed to be able to give testimony bearing upon the petition. We have perhaps, specially in mind the case that might occur because of the fact that we require particulars to be given in the petition. It was suggested as an objection to our requiring particulars to be given that the respondent, being made aware of the particular things that were in view, might cause to be spirited away witnesses in a position to establish the facts. This clause was intended in a special way to protect the petitioner against that condition of affairs. Since the petitioner has the obligation imposed upon him by section 4, if that be adopted, to set forth in an intelligible manner the ground on which he relies, if he can satisfy the judge that there is danger that immediately upon that knowledge becoming available, efforts will be made to get witnesses out of the way, he should be enabled to have the witnesses summoned and examined. And it seemed to us that not only in that instance, but speaking generally, wherever circumstances satisfy the judge that the interests of justice require an immediate examination of witnesses, he should have authority to make that examination. There are sections in the present law which deal in a specific way with cases of absent witnesses. There are section 21 which deals with the parties to the petition; section 22 which deals with the person who was the candidate; and sections 23 and 24 which deal with the form of examining the classes of persons referred to. These sections are made applicable to the class of cases we are now dealing with. There is also another provision, section 45, with regard to special examination during the trial. What we are trying to do is to generalize these provisions with regard to particular persons and particular cases and to create a power in the judge under which, if either party can satisfy him that the interests of justice require it, immediate examination may be ordered of any person able to give testimony bearing upon the petition. And, as I have stated, we had especially in mind the consequence that might result from our provision requiring particulars in the petition. We thought that this would be an effective method of obviating one very serious objection that might be made to the requirements proposed to be made by section 4.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The right hon. leader of the Opposition has stated that "in the interests of justice" is a very broad term, in regard to which judges may differ. Why not provide that where it is made to appear to the court by affidavit that the evidence of a witness materially affecting the trial may be obtained, an examination may be ordered, so that where a party takes the responsibility of swearing that, according to his belief, a witness may be able to discover material evidence, an examination of that witness may take place.

Mr. DOHERTY: The suggestion made tends to restrict, not to enlarge the conditions respecting such examinations. We did consider trying to specify the particular reasons, but the conclusion reached was that while by doing that we might make it perfectly clear that under certain conditions this might be done, if we failed to foresee all the conditions in which the interests of justice might require it, we would leave an uncovered case. I cannot quite grasp the idea that any judge would suppose that the interests of justice should require the examination of a witness unless it were shown to him that there was ground to believe that that witness could give testimony material to the matter alleged, or unless it were shown to him that there was reason to apprehend that that witness might not be available at the trial or that there was danger of the witness being tampered with. It seemed to us that the wisest course was to give to the judge power to provide for the examination of a witness wherever the interests of justice require it, and we felt confident that the court would take that to mean the interests of justice in connection with the particular case under consideration. I do not know whether the hon. member apprehends that under this provision any judge may take unto himself power to have a witness examined with regard to some matter outside of the case. If he thinks there is any danger of that, it may be well to put in appropriate words to make the provision clear, but I think that it is wiser for us not to try to put down in black and white all the possible combinations of circumstances under which the interests of justice may require that examination.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What relation has this proposed provision to section 45, subsection 1, of the Act, which provides that a witness intending to leave Canada may be examined by order of the court, made on notice of the parties? This proposed section provides that any witness may be examined at any time under order of the court, made upon ex parte application. What I desire to suggest is, that if a witness desires to leave Canada, under this section an ex parte application may be made to the court for his examination, if it is thought to be in the interests of justice that he should be examined in order that his testimony may be available at the trial.

Mr. DOHERTY: It seemed to the committee that the provisions of section 45 are applicable only to examination during the trial.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would hardly have supposed that, because it would hardly be presumed that a witness who had been duly subpoenaed would leave Canada during the course of a trial. I would be inclined, subject to the view of the committee, to interpret section 45 as having general application. Of course, if the view which the committee takes is correct, there is no inconsistency or over-lapping, but if the view should prevail that section 45 is of general effect, there would be an inconsistency between it and the proposed provision of this section.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to the fact that the words "in the interests of justice" are very wide, not only in respect of election trials, but of other trials as well. If there is reason to believe that a material witness will not be present at the trial, application can be made to have that witness examined; that is a matter of common law. But, in inserting the words "in the interests of common justice," what case did the committee have in contemplation? If a witness is to be present at the trial, I cannot conceive how justice can be served by his being examined before the trial takes place.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was considering the same question myself, and I assumed that the committee must have had in mind the idea of discovery.

Mr. DOHERTY: It was represented that our requirement of giving particulars was putting the party making the allegation in the unfair position that his opponent would know from the outset just what he was relying upon and would have full opportunity, between the filing of the petition and the coming on of the trial, of resorting to whatever means his conscience might permit to influence or to

get at the people who could give the testimony. That seemed to us to be an objection certainly deserving of consideration. We thought that this provision would enable the judge, wherever either of the parties could satisfy him that there was danger of anything of that kind, that the interest of justice required an immediate examination to prevent it, to order that examination. There are other methods by which a man may be deprived of his testimony than the absence of the witnesses upon whom he relies. I may say in that connection that as a result of the observations that have been made I think it probably would be a wise provision to require that where any witness had been so examined under an order of this kind, if procurable, he should again be brought forward at the trial and offered for further examination if that was desired. But the real purpose of this provision was to create a situation where at any stage, even a day after the lodging of the petition, if the petitioner can make it clear to the court that there is great danger that once his petition becomes known to the adversary means may be found to deprive him of his evidence by any method, that he may be authorized at once to examine such people as he can show, prima facie, can give material evidence upon the petition. That is what we had in view in using these general expressions, going beyond the provision which had regard to people who may be absent from Canada. As regards the time within which this may be done, I do not think we want to be too absolute in saying that the provision in section 45 applies only to the time of the trial. But there seemed to us, at all events as regards time, that there might be a possible argument made in support of that proposition. In the first place, we find in sections 21 and 22, the sections that deal with the examination of parties to the petition or of the person who may be a candidate, that that examination can only be made after issue is joined. Then we have section 45, which is placed in the subdivision of the statute which is headed " Trial of Petition;" and I think I would be correct in saying that all of the other provisions deal with proceedings at the trial. The section provides:

> If it is made to appear to the court or trial judges that any witness intends to leave Canada and will not attend the trial—

Then, on application to the court, the court may grant an order for the examination of such witness. I am not prepared to say nor do I think the committee meant to commit itself to the proposition that this section only applies during the trial; but at all events it seems susceptible to argument that this section applies only to the trial and that it further limits the rights to examination after issue joined. It seemed to us that there was no provision in the statute which could clearly be interpreted as entitling one to have an examination at any time after the filing of the petition; and, with regard to the time, we thought, if we were to make this an effective method of meeting the circumstances that might arise, that it should be made clear that the examination could be at any time and further that it might be an examination of persons other than the parties to the petition and other than a person who was about to leave Canada.

4 p.m.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If I correctly apprehend my hon. friend, the reason for the amendment of the existing rule is that at present there is the ordinary provision for the examination of a witness who may possibly not be present at the trial. I understand the new provision amounts to this, that either party to the suit may go to the judge and represent to him that there is, for instance, a charge of bribery and that unless the party who ought to have the benefit of this witness, either for or against the petition, has the privilege of at once examining him, he has reason to fear that the witness may be tampered with or that for some other reason his evidence at the trial would not be as unbiased and as genuine as it would be if it were at once taken. I do not undertake to say that the provision should not be adopted, but it is certainly a novel proposition and requires reflection. If we want to have fair and speedy trials, I am not prepared to say that the provision should not be found in the Bill, but my hon. friend will agree that it will be absolutely novel, contrary to anything that we know of, and I think it requires more consideration than we have been able to give it up to the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why not make the section broad enough to allow either party to bring up a witness for examination before the trial, either before or after issue is joined? We profess—and I trust we are all sincere—that we want to bring out the truth in these election petitions, to secure speedy judgment and to unseat or disqualify

any candidate who has been guilty, by himself or his agents, of corrupt practices. Why not give the fullest opportunity to get at all the facts, and why not provide that at any time after the petition is served, upon ex parte application, the petitioner or respondent, upon affidavit stating that in the belief of the deponent material facts may be disclosed by an examination of such and such a party, the deponent shall be entitled to have the party brought up and examined?

Mr. DOHERTY: That is what we meant to do.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend does not do it. He throws the burden upon the petitioner or respondent of satisfying the judge that it is in the interest of justice that he should do that. In 99 cases out of 100 the judges would fail to apprehend how it would be in the interest of justice to examine a witness before the trial; they would fail to apprehend that the mere fact that there is danger of a witness being tampered with is a reason for examining him and disclosing what he knows. The judge might think he would be more apt to be tampered with after he had disclosed under oath what he had to say than before. He would be more apt to be removed out of the country. Why not make it broad enough so that upon affidavit any man can be examined?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Ordinary discovery.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: There is an obvious and very fair answer to the hon. member for St. John. He knows better than I that the first consideration which affects the mind of a judge is the conduct of a witness in the witness box. In drawing this section in the committee we did not desire to deprive the court of the benefit of seeing the witnesses except in extreme cases, and these extreme cases I think are met by the further amendment suggested by the Minister of Justice, namely, that if and when the trial comes on the witness that has been examined is still in the country and can be examined, he should, notwithstanding the fact that he has given his testimony, be brought before the court and give his testimony in the presence of the judges, who are thus able to see his demeanour and derive the advantage that one always gets from observing the actual manner in which the witness has given his testimony.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My suggestion would not alter that principle at all; it would be rather an examination for discovery.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend knows better than I do that it is at variance with well recognized principles of procedure that all witnesses should be examined for discovery. All witnesses should be examined in court except in the case of the plaintiff and defendant, or as in this case, the petitioner and respondent who may be examined for discovery, or except in the case of a witness who may want to leave the country and who may be examined de bene esse. My hon. friend is aware of the fact that many difficulties have been experienced in cases of this kind. Men get out of the country as soon as they find their names in an election petition. They take enforced vacations at the expense of their friends. Sometimes they go to Europe and sometimes they have been known to go to the neighbouring republic and stay away for six months. We have no election petitions in our country, and therefore I can speak on this subject with all the more freedom.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Nor in the county from which the hon. gentleman comes.

Mr. BENNETT: They always had a protest, but no trial.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They never have any protest in Northumberland.

Mr. BENNETT: I fancy that is because of the extreme purity with which elections are conducted there, or it may be the facility with which men change sides, having regard to the history of that county. There is something called the Northumberland deal that my hon. friend remembers and that possibly illustrates the point. What influenced the committee was solely this, that in order if possible to perpetuate the testimony of a necessary witness up to the time of the trial when he himself could not be there to give his evidence, an opportunity should be afforded of taking his testimony, and I agree with the Minister of Justice that this should be done. We should at once permit an ex parte application to be made to the judge, have a subpoena issued and have the witness' testimony taken down, due notice being given to the respondent, or the petitioner, as the case may be, and thus have the evidence perpetuated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is the application to the judge to be made as a matter of course or for cause?

Mr. BENNETT: That brings up a question that engaged the attention of the committee: what are the reasons for providing an extraordinary procedure of this kind? About that we had many a discussion. One hon. gentleman urged this and another urged that, but the final conclusion we came to was that the words that now appear in the section, "in the interests of justice," should be inserted. Instead of adopting the old language of the Judicature Act, namely, "for the proper conduct of the trial," we have said, "in the interests of justice". That means that the party making the application to the judge or court will do so believing that it is in the interests of justice, using that word in its broad sense, that the testimony of a particular witness should be taken at once. You cannot define all the cases and, since you cannot define them, what words are you going to use which will cover all of the cases better than the words "in the interest of justice"? The expression, "the proper conduct of the trial," does not comprehend all the cases which would come within the term, "in the interest of justice". The determination of the question as to which particular case comes within the definition is left to judicial discretion. I think we can fairly trust the exercise of so extraordinary a power to the discretion of the court as is done under the English Judicature Act which has almost a similar provision. You can take immediate proceedings for the purpose of obtaining the testimony of a witness but the testimony cannot be used at the trial unless it appears that the witness is dead or is out of the country. This whole code approximates closely to the civil code. Examination for discovery, examination de bene esse, examination of witnesses about to leave the country and all that sort of thing are provided for. The committee were not particularly wedded to the words "in the interest of justice" but no other words were suggested which were sufficiently comprehensive to meet every condition that might arise.

Mr. GERMAN: My hon. friend the Minister of Justice can see—and I apprehend that is the principle or rule of this subsection—that this examination can take place even before the petition is served or filed?

Mr. DOHERTY: Not before it is filed, for then there is no proceeding.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Mr. GERMAN: Well, then, before it is served. There is no solicitor on the record to appear on behalf of the respondent.

Mr. DOHERTY: The application may be made at once. There is a provision that this examination must be had after notice to the party or his counsel. The application would be made at once so that the order could issue for the examination of the witness.

Mr. GERMAN: The order is issued for the examination, but who is to take the responsibility of appearing on the examination? There is no respondent to serve, and there is no solicitor on the record to appear for the respondent. The petitioner can file his petition, he makes an ex parte application, and gets an order for one witness—not one, but fifty, perhaps. It may be a personal charge of corruption, it may be a charge of tampering with an election, of exercising undue influence upon an elector; and suppose you have fifty charges of that kind the petitioner could make application for the subpoenaing of fifty men, get an order, examine the whole fifty, and you have the whole case ready for trial before the respondent has been served or has had an opportunity of taking any action in the matter.

Mr. DOHERTY: The applicant might make his application, but he could not get this order without giving notice to the party, and he and his counsel would be entitled to be present at the examination. All he can do is to get his order, but he cannot proceed with it without notifying the other party—either himself or his solicitor.

Mr. GERMAN: Would it not be easy to spirit away a witness just as soon as the respondent knows which witnesses are to be examined? The witnesses are not notified. Application is made for the examination of ten or twenty witnesses, and the applicant gets his order. Is it a very difficult matter for these witnesses to be spirited away before they can be served? How are you going to advance the interests of justice there?

Mr. DOHERTY: The order may be made and at once served on the witness.

Mr. GERMAN: It cannot be served the same day.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will admit that we do not pretend that we have been able to devise a cast iron arrangement which will absolutely prevent the possibility of it

being evaded, but we think we have provided a method which, while it may not reach some cases, will reach a great many. What the hon. gentleman has said is precisely what demonstrates the wisdom of our making a provision that this order should be made only when the judge thinks it is desirable. I understand the objection from the hon. gentleman to be that this is not restricted enough, whereas, the objection of the right hon. leader of the Opposition is that it is too wide. I am quite ready to admit that it is an innovation in the wide scope it gives for this sort of exceptional examination, but just because it is that I fail to see the force of the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, which is in reality that we ought to throw it wide open without any reference as to whether anybody can satisfy any judge that there is occasion for it, and that we should allow them to subpœna everybody of their own motion and examine them for discovery. I cannot quite grasp the necessity of doing that. I share the apprehension of the right hon. gentleman that this would be extending the thing too far, and from that point of view I believe we should retain the check of requiring the judge to be satisfied that there is occasion for resorting to this exceptional procedure. If we could find words which would more closely define occasions when this power should be exercised, and not unduly restrict the power of the judge, I should be very happy to incorporate them in the section. The committee did not put this forward as being an infallible conclusion or one that is not open to consideration, but after having threshed out a great many of the objections which have been raised here, we thought that the words in the Bill expressed the idea as well as we were capable of expressing it. It certainly did not occur to us that it would be desirable to provide for a general examination on discovery of everybody, at the instance of either party.

Mr. GERMAN: This examination cannot certainly take place before a judge, because the witnesses could not be taken to Osgoode Hall to be examined. They would be examined in the county in which they reside, before the local registrar of the court. The first thing that would have to be done after the order was issued, would be to file the order with the local registrar where the trial would take place, and then there would have to be an appointment to examine one witness, or as many witnesses as the petitioner or respondent saw fit to examine. That would take some days, and then there would have to be a number of days before the witnesses could be subpœnaed. How are you therefore to prevent the spiriting away of witnesses and the instruction of witnesses? I have no serious objection to the section, because what will be sauce for the goose will be sauce for the gander, but I submit that the minister is placing on the statute book a law which eventually will be found to be unworkable. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) said it corresponds with the English procedure but it does not correspond with the English procedure any more closely than it corresponds with the Canadian procedure in the examination of witnesses de bene esse. I believe that under the present Controverted Elections Act you can do all that is sought to be done here.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No.

Mr. GERMAN: I think that under section 45, if you can convince a judge that it is necessary to perpetuate the evidence of a witness for use at the trial, you can get an order for the examination of that witness, but you are going beyond that in this case. I am strongly of the opinion that you are doing something which will be regretted even by the members of the committee who reported this Bill to the House. I do not care particularly one way or the other; if the minister is prepared to take the responsibility, he can do so.

Mr. BURNHAM: Has the minister in any way taken into consideration what I ventured to urge before the members of the committee when they required me to appear before them? The misconduct of people during an election is like any other misconduct, and public opinion is the eventual arbiter in all these things. If a man gets drunk, you arrest him, and you give the evidence and the case is disposed of; and people come to the conclusion either that the man is a disorderly character or that an injustice has been done him, because, being more or less familiar with the evidence, they are capable of forming an opinion. If misconduct in the conduct of an election takes place, the culprit should be brought up in court for conspiring with others against the public weal, by giving or accepting a bribe, and on evidence being given, the magistrate should dispose of the case. That would not of itself void any election, but it would have a tremendous effect upon the election; and if, in the course

of time, some of these people were brought into the police court, and it were found that this sort of thing was going on, by the finding of the magistrate, the effect on the public would be so tremendous—assuming that the public care about it at all—that the candidate whose agents were acting in that way would stop it all, or else the candidate would certainly be defeated at the polls. I am thoroughly convinced, from bitter experience, that the colossal undertaking of an election petition is so serious and expensive a business, and so likely to go off, that it is almost impossible to proceed with a protest. At the trial of the election petition your expenses are about $300 or possibly $500 a day, putting it mildly. You say So-and-so is to be called as a witness at two o'clock, and two o'clock comes and he is not there. It is said, "Oh, he is ill," and a doctor gives a certificate to the effect that he cannot appear. What are you going to do? You stop the trial. The next day the same thing occurs—he cannot appear. There is an important witness gone, perhaps important witnesses gone. The bottom is knocked out of the whole case; whereas if you could arrest the culprits during the course of an election, if you could watch them and take them by the scruff of the neck to the police court and say: "Here is a man corrupting the people," and you prove it, you can have him fined a dollar or sent down for ten days, if you like. As long as the people know that corrupt practices are going on, they will hold that candidate more or less responsible. It is quite possible that the candidate is not the man really liable for the conduct of his agent; but the general tenor of the whole election contest is made quite plain. The people know the history of these men quite well, because men are not picked up at a moment's notice for the purpose of carrying out all sorts of wrong-doing at an election. They are well known; they are usually experienced; and if they are properly watched and the opportunity is given, you can break up any system of corruption in a very few days; but if such men can sail around and have their headquarters at hotels and live like prize-fighters, and enjoy themselves thoroughly and be absolutely free while they are perpetrating all sorts of wrongs of this description, all they need to do is to clear out immediately after the election is over; and where they are no one knows: the deed is done, the public is defied. In the other case, that is not so. If they had the opportunity, policemen would simply say to these men: "You are wanted in here; give an account of yourself; what are you doing?" You do that with all sorts of fakirs; you do it with people who cannot give an account of themselves; you do it with drunkards and people who commit misdemeanours of various sorts; but in the conduct of an election, which concerns the public weal more than anything else, you omit it; you do not allow it. Surely some simple device of this description might be added to the other machinery which would enable people desirous of breaking corrupt practices to do it in time, and not have to spend thousands and tens of thousands of dollars on a trial which consists partly of a contest between lawyers to defeat the ends of justice and of witnesses who desire to escape giving testimony.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are no doubt many crudities, apparent or real, in the Bill now before the committee. The truth is that no committee can within a limited period of time draft amendments to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act which will not be found imperfect. It should be the work of capable men for many months, perhaps a year or more, to revise this Act successfully. As a matter of fact, the committee engaged in revising the Dominion Controverted Elections Act practically gets no assistance whatever from the officers of the Crown or the Department of Justice. We have the assistance of parliamentary counsel, but their time is divided up on account of their being engaged in other duties, and the result is that any drafting is very liable to be imperfect. I am very much impressed with the objection made to this section by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). I do not think that any member of the committee ever expected that this section would not meet with some very substantial opposition from members of the House when placed before it for consideration and review.

Section 45 of the Bill was intended to enable the examination of a witness upon notice, where it was abundantly clear that he intended to leave Canada, and that either the respondent or the petitioner were desirous of having his evidence taken. It may be remembered that in section 3 of the Bill, which defines the form of the petition, it is provided that the complaint shall be set out with some particularity. Just how far that should go, we are not at all clear, and we are agreed

that that section of the Bill should remain over for the present.

Section 10, which we are now considering, was inserted just because there was an amendment provided by section 4 in respect to the form of the petition. Some of the members of the committee thought that, inasmuch as the petitioner was compelled to set forth in his petition with some particularity the details of his complaint, he ought to have some opportunity in some way or other of examining the witnesses before the trial so as to circumvent the very usual practice of having witnesses leave the jurisdiction of the court. Inasmuch as we have passed over section 4 for consideration, I would suggest that we let this section stand, because if section 4 is changed we may find it quite easy to remove the objections which have been urged against this section. I must admit the objections are fairly substantial, and I am not sure that they have been well answered so far.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The great difficulty in proceeding with an election trial is to get the material witnesses. They are spirited away by some means or other, and the ends of justice are thwarted. How to prevent that is a matter for the lawyers to decide, but tnere is worse than that. At election times there are brought in from other countries, for example from the United States, men who have been Canadian citizens or who are perhaps still Canadian citizens, but who are employed in the United States and who can leave conveniently a day or two after the election is over. They come to Canada for the purpose of doing an illegal or highly improper act. How can such men be detained in the country and brought to trial? I cannot suggest any method; that will be for judicial minds to decide. If an application could be made under oath to a judge by some responsible, reputable citizen or by one of the candidates who is aware of conduct of that kind being done, whereby those men could be detained in the country or their evidence got in some way much good would result. That in my judgment would add very materially to having justice done.

Mr. DOHERTY: As regards what the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I., says, this section possibly does not go very far to detain such a witness; but it would give some assistance in so far as it would at least make it possible for any person to make a petition at as early a date as he pleased, and thereupon to obtain an order to make such witness appear on some day, so that if the witness did not do so, he could be punished for contempt of court. But unless the proposition itself will meet with the approval of the House, there would be no useful purpose in our pressing for more effective means to enforce it.

With regard to the observation of my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), I would point out that he is under a false impression if he supposes that there is at present no method of punishing unlawful practices at elections other than by election petition. If he refers to the Dominion Elections Act, he will find quite a number of provisions providing penalties either by actions instituted to recover them, by indictment before the criminal court or by summary prosecution. I have not all these before me, but I might refer to some of them. For instance, power is conferred upon the deputy returning officer to constitute constables with authority to arrest people who are guilty of unlawful practices. I admit that in these matters our law is susceptible of improvement, but it is not correct to say that there is no provision for prosecution before the criminal courts for unlawful practices at elections. The committee dealing with these two items were strongly impressed with the view that what was a lacking in the Dominion Elections Act was not so much the creation of offences and the imposing of penalties, but rather an effective instrument of enforcement. What we are trying now to deal with is a measure providing a method by which you can rectify the wrong done in the return of the wrong man. But in the Dominion Elections Act there are provisions for the punishment in the manner I have indicated of those guilty of unlawful acts at elections.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is there anything other than by indictment?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is provision for action for penalties and also for trial for summary conviction. It would take a long time to read all these provisions, but I might give my hon. friend some references. Under the heading " Corrupt practices and other illegal acts," sections 265 and following define the corrupt practices and prescribe penalties; and under 284 and following are provisions for the enforcement of these penalties. These are in addition to the provision respecting indictable offences and offences made punishable on summary conviction. The particular sections dealing with indictable offences, I have not under

my hand, but I know that there are such provisions. As to the suggestion of the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), there is no doubt that this section is affected very much by what is done with regard to sections 4 and 5. We of the committee regarded this Bill as one whose sections completed each other and provided a more effective method of trying election petitions. No doubt most of the sections are so interdependent that one can hardly be considered apart from the rest. Yet there is more immediate connection between this section and sections 4 and 5 than between the others. Therefore, I have no objection to adopt the hon. member's suggestion and allow this section to stand until we come to deal finally with sections 4 and 5.

On section 11—place of trial; trial to proceed until all evidence taken:

Mr. GERMAN: The suggestion was made before lunch: if the respondent admits liability and the petitioner is content with that, who will supply the witnesses to go on with other cases?

Mr. DOHERTY: The section does not purport to provide a method by which they can supply them. But it does provide:

> The trial judges shall proceed with the trial until all the evidence relevant to the particulars filed in the case has been heard, notwithstanding any admission on the part of the respondent of corrupt or illegal practices sufficient to void the election, and notwithstanding that in the opinion of the court enough evidence has been heard to void the election.

This is another provision inserted to meet the possible suggestion that the court is without power to go on after enough has been established by admission or evidence to void the election.

Mr. GERMAN: Why not say that the court "may" proceed, instead of "shall" proceed?

Mr. DOHERTY: We make it the court's duty. If, notwithstanding the admission of the respondent, notwithstanding there being enough proof to void the election, the petitioner wants to go on to ventilate other cases of bribery, we want it to be made the duty of the judge to go on and deal with these matters, if they are covered by the petition.

Mr. GERMAN: Suppose he does not want to go on?

Mr. DOHERTY: All we have said is that the judge shall proceed with the trial until all the evidence relative to the particulars filed in the case has been heard. If everybody stopped bringing in evidence, the court would not be able to hear any more; we have said that they shall go on until all the evidence is heard.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I had a good deal of experience in the trial of election petitions many years ago, and the course usually adopted was this: after the petitioner had put in his evidence and the judges had come to the conclusion, upon that evidence and upon any that the respondent had adduced in regard to the several charges made, that enough evidence had been submitted to justify the voidance of the election, he usually asked the petitioner whether or not he desired to proceed with the personal charges. The petitioner had to answer yes or no, the judges usually intimating that if the petitioner proceeded with the personal charges against the respondent and did not succeed, he would be visited with the costs of his unsuccessful attempt.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In recent years the practice in Nova Scotia has been that even if the respondent admitted sufficient corrupt and illegal practices to void the election, the court nevertheless proceeded with the case. This proposed provision is putting into statutory form the effect of the practice of the courts in recent years.

Mr. GERMAN: The opinion expressed in the newspapers of Ontario is that the trial of a petition should not be dropped simply because the respondent admits his guilt. This section provides that the court shall go on with the case, but if the petitioner does not wish to go on, he cannot be compelled to bring witnesses to the court and to produce evidence. How, then, will the court proceed? There is no procedure under this Act, so far as I can see, which will secure the attendance of witnesses in such cases to establish personal charges against the respondent. The object of the trial of election petitions, aside from the proving of charges which would disqualify the person elected, is to ascertain whether or not corruption existed in the constituency during the election.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: In all our provinces, the consent of the court or judge must be obtained before an action can be discontinued.

Mr. GERMAN: In Ontario a party may discontinue the suit by filing discontinuance papers and paying costs.

Mr. BENNETT: The English precedent is that you have to have the consent of the court or judge. But if judgment against the defendant is obtained by the plaintiff on consent, the judge may say: I am not satisfied that the matter shall be settled merely by consent; I am going to examine witnesses.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think I understand the motive of this section. In the trial of an election petition, one hundred witnesses having been heard, or one witness having been heard whose evidence proves one charge sufficient to void the election, the respondent may say: I confess judgment; I am willing that the seat shall be declared vacant. In this case, the objection is that the taking of further evidence might establish that a general system of bribery and corruption had been in operation throughout the district. I believe it is wise, therefore, that under such circumstances the court shall be directed to proceed with the case and to make a report to Parliament as to whether or not there was in the district concerned a general system of bribery and corruption. I think the section is a wise one.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My observation of election trials during the last ten years has been that the solicitor really makes little effort to secure the disqualification of the respondent. The purpose of an election trial to-day is to ascertain whether or not a general system of bribery has prevailed. No solicitor conducting an election case will accept an admission of corrupt and illegal practices on the part of the respondent and a final order unseating the candidate. What I mean is that if a trial is conducted on that basis, the solicitor does not perform his whole duty, because the whole purpose of an election trial is, as I have said, to disclose any system of bribery and corruption which may have prevailed. It should be remembered also that the hearing of an election petition is really not a trial, in the ordinary sense of the word; it is an inquiry. Parliament, having delegated to the courts the duty of inquiring into alleged illegal practices in connection with elections, must give to the courts power to go beyond the desires and requests of counsel engaged in the case. I think the distinction must be held clearly in mind that the hearing of an election petition is not a trial, but an inquiry.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I entirely agree with the view that the court should have power to proceed in such cases, if the circumstances of the case make it, in their judgment, desirable that they should do so. But if witnesses have not been subpœnaed, is the petitioner to be directed to subpœna them? What means will the judge have of proceeding with the trial if the petitioner does not desire to take the responsibility of doing so? I do not object to the purpose of the section at all; I think it is a very good one, and I think that the judge should have the power which is assigned to him under its provisions, but I am not desirous of putting something on the statute book which may appear to fulfil certain objects, and which will not, in the end, fulfil them at all.

Mr. PROULX: If counsel do not wish to put witnesses in the box, can the judge force them to do so, or hold them guilty of contempt of court if they do not do so?

Mr. DOHERTY: Three conditions may arise. In the first place, in the case where the defendant has admitted enough to void the election or where there is proof enough to void the election, and the petitioner wants to proceed with the case, we say to the judge: You shall go on. We do not say: You may if you want to; we say: You shall, because we want to have brought out whatever can be brought out that is in the public interest.

Mr. GERMAN: The judge may say: Prove all these charges.

Mr. DOHERTY: I may be quite mistaken, but if that is already the law perhaps the hon. gentleman would show me the text. If that is the law but if there is no express text, what harm can be done by saying perfectly clearly in this statute what the hon. gentleman believes to be the law now?

To me there are three combinations of circumstances that may arise. That is the first. Under these circumstances, in my judgment, the law ought to be imperative; it should not be in the power of the judge to say: no, I have enough evidence and I am going to render judgment. Then, there is, secondly, the case suggested by the right hon leader of the Opposition, where both parties say that they have enough evidence; perhaps the respondent has got in the box and has said: "I admit that by an agent or without my knowledge enough corruption was perpetrated to void this election," and there are sitting there a whole host of witnesses, and the petitioner says, "under these circumstances I am willing to accept that." Surely that

will be quite a clear case of duty to the judge to examine the people who are there. They have been brought there to prove allegations which we presume are specific and which upon their face are allegations of corruption and bribery that ought to be exposed. It seems to me in that case we should make it imperative for the judge to continue the inquiry. That is the second case.

Then, there is the case where it may be impossible for the judges to go any further. I do not understand that our imperative section would alter the fact that if neither party would adduce evidence and there were no available witnesses there, then the court would be in the position of having heard all the evidence. We might use the word "available" in that case, because the court would not be able to go on, but would be in the position of having heard all the available evidence. What I think the committee had in mind was that he could go ahead as far as there was available evidence. If there is no evidence there to be heard, the judge cannot hear it, and he may take it that that is a condition where he has heard all the evidence. I do not think we would meet the purpose of the committee by saying that the judge may do that. We want to create a situation where, as far as possible, it would be the judge's duty, within the limit of the charges made, to hear all available evidence upon them, even although it might go beyond what was necessary to void the election. What was necessary to void the election may have been established by admissions.

Mr GERMAN: My hon. friend perhaps misunderstood what I had in mind. I do not think the Controverted Elections Act in express terms says that a judge shall go on and hear all the evidence the petitioner chooses to present to the court. My belief is that the judge is morally bound, perhaps not by express terms, to hear all the evidence which the petitioner will adduce to establish the charges which were alleged in the petition; because it is not one issue of fact as to whether or not this man is entitled to the seat. A petition comprises several issues of fact; in fact, every section of the petition raises an issue of facts in itself. So that the one fact that the man is not entitled to hold the seat by reason of bribery and corruption proved voids the seat, but that does not dispose of all the issues raised by the petition or pleadings. I understand that a court would simply say: We are bound to hear all the evidence which the petitioner brings before us to establish the case as alleged in the pleadings which are before the court. To that extent I think the trial judges are bound to hear all the evidence the petitioner presents. When the petitioner is satisfied, saying, "I do not care to go any further," the seat is voided. Then you say by this section that the judge shall go on and further investigate. So far as my observations have shown, the practice is that the witnesses are not all subpoenaed for the first day; probably only one or two will be subpoenaed for the first day. Generally the strongest case the petitioner can make is taken up first. When you say here that the trial judge shall further investigate, you do not provide any means for having him do so unless you say that the witnesses shall be subpoenaed, and then you do not provide any means for furnishing them or say who is to pay the costs. If you say that he "may" go on, he may do so now. If you use the word "shall," it makes it compulsory on the trial judge to go on and subpoena witnesses of his own volition.

5 p.m.

Mr. DOHERTY: The objection would be met if you put in the word "available" before the words "and relevant." Then we would not place any obligation on the judge to go out on the highways and byways and look for witnesses. We would simply say to him: It shall be your duty to go on with the available and relevant witnesses.

Mr. MORPHY: Would it do to add the word "then" and make it then available as applicable to the witnesses then present at the trial?

Mr. DOHERTY: That might be very well where neither party wants to go on; but if the petitioner wants to go on, we should make it the judges' duty to hear the evidence he will adduce, and he should be entitled to make evidence available by subpoenaing more people for the next day if they are not there that day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would it not be better to use the word "may," because we know that in actual practice if the parties agree that there has been enough evidence, that the admission is sufficient, that the election is going to be voided, they will take care to have the witnesses beyond the control of the judges. What is the use of putting it in if it is to become a mere farce? If you gave permission to the judges to continue the hearing, it would be very much

better. In ordinary practice no judge would go on unless one or other of the parties wanted him to do so.

Mr. DOHERTY: The intention of this legislation is that the judge shall go on. I have heard it said repeatedly in civil courts by judges that they had heard all the evidence they required, that the case was proved, and they were prepared to give judgment and would not waste time hearing more evidence. It is by no means clear to me that a judge in an election case is not, under our statute as it now stands, free to say the same thing.

Most of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken seem to think that under the law at the present time the judge would be bound to go on. I do not think we would disagree as to the desirability of his being bound to go on if the petitioner desired it. I have not been able to find any provision in the statutes under which the judge would not be at liberty if he thought proper, to say that for the purposes of the petition he did not propose to go on even if the petitioner wanted to go on. I think that we should have the word " shall " in the section. I do not see what harm would come from requiring the judge to go on with the case where there is available evidence to substantiate the charge. The public interest demands that where there is available evidence the matter should be gone into. Of course, as the hon. member for St. John says, the parties could put themselves in a position where there would not be available evidence. No great injury will come to anybody from requiring the judge to proceed with the available evidence.

Mr. MARCIL: The Minister of Justice is very familiar with everything that has taken place in the province of Quebec. Without referring to the legal side of this question, the minister knows that in the last thirty years in the province of Quebec the two parties have agreed as to whether or not the evidence is to be produced, the case allowed to go to court and an attempt made to have the election voided. There are not half a dozen cases in the last thirty years where the issue was pressed and disqualification asked for. The belief is present in the minds of those who have discussed the question that we will never be able to get at the bottom of these political cases unless they are taken out of the hands of the political parties and it is suggested that the only way to sift the matter to the bottom is to have a public prosecutor appointed for that purpose. Has the committee given this phase of the question any consideration at all?

Mr. DOHERTY: We did consider the question, but we did not hope to be able to devise a plan for the appointment of such an official which would be satisfactory and which would pass this House. We are trying to do it in a more modest way than the procedure which the hon. gentleman suggests. I quite welcome the criticism we have had, but I think it shows that we cannot hope to do everything at once in the direction of improvement, and more particularly in the direction of securing an inquiry when the parties to the proceedings may not be over anxious to have the matter probed. I think, however, that what we did is a considerable step in advance if the House accepts it. Something in the direction of what the hon. gentleman suggests, if it met with general acceptance, would also be desirable but the committee have no proposition of that kind to present on that subject.

Mr. PROULX: Has the minister added the word " available"?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think that the section would be altered by putting in the word " available." Nobody, not even a judge, is bound by law to do the impossible. If he is told that he shall hear all the relevant evidence it must mean all the relevant evidence within his hearing.

On section 12—after thirty days clerk of court to apply, and court to fix day for trial:

Mr. PUGSLEY: Section 12 having been adopted, I wish to suggest for the consideration of the committee an amendment which would come in very properly at this point because it would be in addition to section 57 which is the last dealing with trials for corrupt practices. I think the committee will agree with me that the law relating to elections is to-day very strict indeed. As the Minister of Justice has remarked, we have plenty of law on the subject, ample, one would suppose, to secure purity of elections, but unfortunately it has not had that result. There is more corruption at elections to-day notwithstanding the stricter provisions of the law than there ever was in the history of our country. Everybody will admit that the corruption which takes place at elections is only limited by the means of the representatives of the parties and their ability to spend it.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No, their ability to get it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well, ability to get it. Unfortunately, that is the case. The agents of the two parties vie with each other in getting the greatest number of votes and they do not seem to have any fear of the law or any fear of election petitions. They do not fear anything, either on earth below or in heaven above, and they all do their very best to win the election. Then they have in their minds that in the majority of cases there will be saw-offs in connection with these petitions, and they will get rid of any difficulty in that way. They have the expectation that no election will be voided for corrupt practices, perhaps by common consent, and therefore one side can rely upon the other to either abandon proceedings or not to take any proceedings.

Every person who has had to do with controverted election petitions will admit that the law has been an absolute failure. We have provisions now that any person taking a bribe shall be subject to imprisonment and shall be disqualified for a term of years from voting, but that does not deter people from taking bribes. We have a provision in the law now that if a person bribes an elector he is liable to imprisonment for a term of years and is disqualified from voting at an election or sitting in Parliament, and that law has proved to be entirely ineffective. This Bill is a very good one because it facilitates the trial of election petitions, but in my opinion it will be just as ineffective as the present law for the prevention of electoral corruption.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I suppose that cannot, by any possible chance, be called an expert opinion.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My own view is that it is better to be frank about the matter than to pretend that a state of affairs exists which does not exist. Every one will admit that, either with or without the knowledge or approval of candidates, the agents, the workers, the party friends of the candidates do all they can to win. If a man is of a high moral tone he justifies his spending money with the statement that you must fight the devil with his own weapons. I have heard very excellent men say that, as an excuse for their going behind the barn and paying something to an elector to vote for their candidate. My own judgment is that this Bill is not going to be any more effective than the present law, and the question is, what can be done? I have always had the idea that if you could hold out to a candidate the expectation that if he and his friends run an absolutely pure election, so that they would be able to satisfy the judges that the election was pure, and that if a sitting member has by himself or his agent been guilty of corrupt acts so that his seat shall become null and void, that the defeated candidate should get the seat. I believe in that way you will accomplish the object we all have in view. I would suggest for the consideration of the Minister of Justice and the committee a section like this:

57. On the trial of a petition under this Act complaining of an undue return, and claiming the seat for any candidate, if the trial judges decide that the election of the sitting member is void, by reason of the commission of corrupt practices on the part of such sitting member or his agent or agents, and the judges are also satisfied that no offence was committed at such election by the candidate on whose behalf the seat is claimed, or by his agent or agents, which would have been sufficient to render his election void in case he had been declared elected, the trial judges shall declare the election of the sitting member null and void and shall declare such candidate, on behalf of whom the seat is claimed, to have been duly elected.

In case the seat is claimed for more than one candidate, two or more of whom the trial judges find have not, either by themselves or their agents, committed an offence which would have been sufficient to render their election void in case they had been declared elected, the trial judges shall, in declaring the election of of the sitting member null and void, also declare such one of the candidates on behalf of whom the seat is claimed, having the majority of the votes cast for such two or more of the candidates on behalf of whom the seat is claimed to have been duly elected.

I would ask the Minister of Justice to look this over and to consider it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Do I understand that the hon. gentleman puts this forward as supplying something which does not exist at all in the present Act?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, there is a provision in the present law that you may have certain ballots struck off from the successful candidate.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That is a scrutiny of the votes?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, but that is not like my amendment. This suggested amendment holds out to the man an opportunity of being given the seat by the judges, who says: I am going to run an absolutely pure election, there is no money to be spent, there is to be no violation of the law permitted which would unseat me if I had been returned, and who being able to prove the purity of his own election can prove

that the sitting member by himself or his agents, has violated the law.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Regardless of what majority the elected candidate may have had?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Regardless of the majority.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: It would be a reward for merit to the candidate and penalty on the constituency.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not necessarily. It may be said that this might be hard upon the constituency, and to a certain extent that is true, but it surely is better to secure purity of elections, even though the constituency might be deprived of the services of the man who violated the law, by himself or his agents.

Mr. BOYCE: Would that be regardless of the finding on a cross-petition against the defeated candidate?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Oh, no. On cross-petition, the defeated candidate's conduct may be inquired into, and the burden would be cast upon him of satisfying the judges that he had run an absolutely pure election, before he could obtain the seat. We have been trying for forty years in this country to secure purity of elections. We have passed most stringent laws providing for putting people in the penitentiary, and providing heavy penalties and disqualifications, but all these laws in the past have been wholly ineffective until to-day electoral corruption prevails to a greater extent than ever, and there is more money spent in elections than ever before in the history of Canada, which perhaps is owing to the country being wealthier than it was in former years. Unless there is some great injustice which would be done to a constituency, I believe that this plan which I venture to suggest would prove most effective in securing electoral purity. Whether it is worth while to subject constituencies to what might be some disadvantage or some injury by not getting the candidate they would prefer, is, of course, another question. But it does seem to me that it is worthy of consideration, because the object aimed at will commend itself to this House and to the people of this country. I believe there would be no more effective mode of securing purity of elections than a law like this, which would give to the man who runs an absolutely pure election an opportunity of getting the seat, and which would deprive the man, who by himself and his agents violated the law, from sitting in Parliament.

Mr. PROULX: Would my hon. friend from St. John make it apply to the candidate, when corruption had been committed without his knowledge?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: Would it not be a great hardship to make him the victim of acts committed by agents, when he had not countenanced such acts at all? I would favour the hon. member's amendment if it applied only to candidates who had been themselves guilty of corrupt acts, or who had knowledge of such acts being committed by their agents; but in cases where they were the victims of zealous friends, it would be a great hardship on such candidates to make the amendment apply.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend knows that the law now compels a member elect to lose his seat by reason of corrupt acts on the part of his agents. It may be a hardship, but the question is: Is the securing of purity of an election of so great importance that the advantage will overcome the disadvantage of a man being held responsible for the actions of his agents? In the running of elections, candidates do have their agents; that is, as a rule the candidates are put up by the parties, and the parties have their agents to manage the elections, and there is no great difficulty in a party securing an absolutely pure election if they make up their minds to do so. The difficulty is to get them to make up their minds to have a pure election. If there were a provision that, if there should be a violation of the law on the part of the candidate or his friends, his opponent might get the seat, it would be very effective in securing purity of elections.

Mr. PROULX: The candidate might be the victim of conspiracy. A man might pose as an agent of the candidate and commit corrupt acts, and then go to court and admit that he had committed corrupt acts for that candidate. In that way he would secure the election for his friend, the other candidate.

Mr. DOHERTY: The law as it stands at present seems to contemplate upon the petition that the seat may be claimed for the other candidate. While I cannot find any special provision for that—

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is provided for in the present law.

Mr. DOHERTY: Section 22 provides for the examination of a candidate, although he is not a party to the petition. It says:

Whenever a petition has been filed claiming the seat for a candidate, such candidate, although not a party to the petition, may be orally examined as if he was a petitioner.

Section 49 provides that:

On the trial of a petition under this Act complaining of an undue return and claiming the seat for any person, the respondent may give evidence to show that the election of such person was undue in the same manner as if he had presented a petition complaining of such election.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Section 50 provides for striking off names.

Mr. DOHERTY: Section 50 says:

If, on the trial of an election petition, claiming the seat for any person, a candidate is proved to have been guilty, by himself or by any person on his behalf of bribery, treating, or undue influence with respect to any person who voted at such election, or if any person retained or employed for reward by or on behalf of such candidate, for all or any or the purposes of such election, as agent, clerk, or messenger, or in any other employment, is proved on such trial to have voted at such election, there shall, on the trial of such election petition, be struck off from the number of votes appearing to have been given to such candidate, one vote for every person who voted at such election, and who is proved to have been so bribed, treated or unduly influenced or so retained or employed for reward as aforesaid.

Then there is also the admission as to what may be done or proved in that particular case, and then the judges are to report.

Section 58 provides that:

At the conclusion of the trial, the trial judges shall determine whether the member whose election or return is complained of or any and what other person was duly returned or elected, or whether the election was void, and other matters arising out of the petition, and requiring their determination.

And so on. I was under the impression —it may be quite a mistake—that there was some form of petition for the claiming of a seat for the respondent. There are certainly provisions under which the seat may be claimed for a candidate. I felt, however, it would be wise, before saying anything as to the desirability of this amendment, to consider the matter more fully.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is perfectly true that the petition very often claims the seat for the respondent. The seat may be so claimed on various grounds: for example, the petition might set up the contention that the person who is declared elected was not a person competent to be declared elected; that he did not fulfil the requisites of the statutes; that he was not a British subject, that he was not of the age of twenty-one years, or something of that kind.

Mr. PROULX: There is no requirement that he should be 21 years of age.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Then there is the result of the contest, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for St. John. For example, if the majority is not a very large one, it may be possible for the respondent to show that a certain number of persons have been bribed or unduly influenced—and for every person so shown to have been bribed or unduly influenced a vote is struck off from the votes of the successful candidate, and that may so reduce his vote that the respondent will have the majority. In that case he is, of course, entitled to claim the seat, and the provisions of the statute with regard to claiming the seat have in contemplation such a condition.

The first difficulty about the proposal of the hon. member for St. John strikes one is this, that as pointed out by the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx), it might contain within it the inducement for a definite and very insidious form of bribery, that is to say, the bribing of persons acting as agents for the successful candidate to commit some improper acts, which will void the seat and thus give it to the other candidate, who cannot be proved guilty of any such offence.

The suggestion put forward by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) is also a very important one. Suppose, for example, that a candidate has polled 4,000 votes, and that the candidate opposed to him has polled only 1,000 votes, and that upon a very careful and full inquiry it may be proved that half a dozen or eight men have been bribed or unduly influenced to vote for the candidate who has received the great majority of votes. The question under these circumstances is whether justice would be done to the constituency by pursuing the course which the hon. member for St. John suggests. According to the premise which he has laid down, the candidate who has been elected may have earnestly determined to conduct the election without offending in any way against the election law, yet through the misdeeds of his agents for which he is not morally

although legally responsible, the election is declared void.

The hon. gentleman proposes that for the action of some one person committed without the knowledge or consent of the candidate, and without any desire or intention on the part of the great majority of the electors that those acts should have been committed, the choice of the constituency in the selection of the candidate is put to one side and the man who represents only one-fifth or one-sixth of the people of that constituency is declared elected.

That would seem to be a very anomalous and very incongruous result. While one is inclined to sympathize with every reasonable effort to bring about reformation in the conditions under which elections are held, I think it would require a great deal of consideration before any such proposal as that could be adopted.

So far as elections are concerned, it seems to me, a great deal depends, in every constituency, upon the condition of public opinion. I have seen elections conducted, within very recent years and in large constituencies in this country, where, I am absolutely sure, the provisions of the election law were well observed on both sides. I believe that was the case in the election held in Halifax in 1908. Public opinion had been aroused very much by some events to which I need not do more than allude, and I think that both sides were resolved that there should be—and at all events, public opinion compelled—a very strict observance of the election law. And there was a strict observance of the election law, I am very sure of that. Very strict measures were taken on one side, and I have no doubt on both sides, to see that the law should be observed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did the same thing continue in 1911?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as I know. I have no doubt it did. I did not speak of 1911, because I was not in the constituency except for a very short time in that election. In reference to what my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) has said, the provisions to which attention is called by the Minister of Justice were in the minds of the people on that occasion as they should be on all occasions. Very great precautions were taken to put these provisions in effect in case any attempt should be made to violate any provision of the Election Act, and with very good results. And I think where public opinion is aroused, as it ought to be aroused in regard to these matters, in any constituency, similar good results will be obtained. The hon. member for St. John city has made a very true statement, that we have plenty of law in this country if it is only properly used. And it seems to me that, in the absence of some such provision as that suggested here to-day—which I myself have spoken of in the past and have advocated—the appointment of a public prosecutor to see that election petitions are prosecuted to the end, it depends largely upon the condition of public opinion in the constituency how strictly the election law is observed. I would have been very glad if the committee had brought forward some feasible measure to provide for the appointment of a public officer who would discharge in the matter of election petitions such duties as are discharged by the public prosecutor in Great Britain. But I have not been insensible to the fact that in a country like this, with our population spread over so enormous an area, it would be a much more difficult task to make provision of that kind than in the case of Great Britain. The committee has made an attempt, a very earnest and I think a somewhat successful attempt, to provide otherwise for the bringing about of such results as have been had, at least in Great Britain, by the functions discharged by the public prosecutor, and I am certainly disposed to support their efforts in that regard to the utmost possible extent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The amendment suggested by my hon. friend from St. John City (Mr. Pugsley) seems to be a drastic one, but it does not involve a new principle; it is simply carrying further the principle which is already in the law. Suppose the case of an election petition. The sitting member—taking the comparison just made by my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden)—has 4,000 votes and his opponent only 1,000 votes, showing that the overwhelming sentiment of the constituency is in favour of the successful candidate. If a single agent of that candidate has committed one single act of corruption, the election is voided and so the will of the people is set aside. This was enacted in order to promote purity of election. But is it straining the spirit of the Act, or proposing anything new, or extravagant, or that will not be accepted, to provide that

the defeated candidate who has done his best to have a pure election should be given the seat? As the hon. member for St. John city has stated, very truly, we have been trying for more than forty years to promote purity of elections by laws such as this: If my memory serves me, our first Controverted Elections Act was passed in 1874. We have been trying ever since by these means to promote purity of elections. The present Bill is a testimonial of the fact that our efforts have not been successful. Is it not, then, right and proper that we should try a further remedy? The punishment we have inflicted against bribery in elections—not necessarily bribery committed by the member, but by any person on his behalf, is to have the election voided. That remedy has signally failed. My hon. friend suggests that in view of our experience we should give the seat to the man who has attempted to have a pure election.

Under the law as it is at present, there are two parties to consider, the successful candidate and the constituency itself—the people. If a man is guilty of an act of corruption his seat is voided. He may have been the overwhelming choice of the people, yet because of one act of imprudence—we will call it merely an act of imprudence—the law steps in and says that his election shall be voided, and not only that but he may be debarred from sitting and disqualified for years. So far as that is concerned the will of the people is defeated, but defeated to a great extent by his own imprudence. But if the candidate is not guilty of personal corruption, but if the corruption has been committed by one of his friends, it seems rather hard that he should have to suffer the penalty of having his elections voided and lose his seat for an act for which certainly, he could not be responsible. Still, the law has not hesitated, either here or in Great Britain, to inflict that injustice upon a candidate, with the single object that we may have, at any cost, purity of elections. We have tried this for forty years, with the very indifferent result we see at the present time. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman is right in spirit when he goes so far as to say that when there is a contest between two men, if upon the side of the successful one there has been corruption either by the candidate or by his friends, and if on the other side there has been a pure election, then the seat ought to go by favour of the law to the other candidate. I would direct the attention of my hon. friend to the case of John Wilkes, whose election as representative of the electoral district of Westminster was set aside three or four times by the British Parliament. At last, after Mr. Wilkes had been repeatedly elected and after his election had been repeatedly set aside, Parliament declared his opponent to be the representative for the constituency, although he was the minority candidate. It thus happened that the representative of the district was not the man who was the choice of the people, but the minority candidate. I give this instance to show to the committee that the suggestion of my hon. friend is not without precedent. As to the suggestion of the hon. member for Prescott that there may be conspiracy on the part of friends of one of the candidates to establish bribery in order that his adversary may loose his seat, this objection applies to the law as it exists to-day with just as much force as it may apply to the provisions suggested by my hon. friend. There is every reason why serious consideration should be given to the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I wish to point out that the law as it stands at present is not precisely as my right hon. friend suggests. In 1882 the election law was amended by a provision which is now embodied in section 56 of the Act, and which provides that if no corrupt practice was committed at the election by the candidate personally; if the candidate took all reasonable means for preventing the commission of corrupt practices; if the offences were of a trivial, unimportant and limited character, and if in other respects the election seemed to have been fairly conducted in accordance with the provisions of the law, then the seat shall not be vacated. I should like to point out also that it is in the interests of the purity of elections that an election may be declared void by reason of offences committed without the candidate's knowledge by agents of the candidate. But in all these cases the rights of the people are regarded, and it is permitted to them again to make a choice, by another election, of the man who shall represent them in Parliament. Probably at the time to which my hon. friend referred—the occasion on which the seat was given to the opponent of Mr. Wilkes—the rights of the people in that regard to their representation in Parliament were not so strictly regarded as they are at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is true that section 56 provides that the elected candidate shall

not be unseated for the commission of trivial or slight offences for which he was not personally responsible, or if he took all reasonable means to prevent the commission of corrupt practices. But it is also true, as my right hon. friend has said, that while the sitting member may have a majority of votes which cannot be challenged, yet, by reason of the commission of corrupt acts by agents, he may be unseated, and in that respect an injustice may be done. That result, however, has been brought about by the operation of the law in the interests of the purity of elections.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As I said, however, the people in that case are given the right to choose another representative.

Mr. MARCIL: If a provision such as this is to be put into the law, I think that the candidate for election should be responsible only for the actions of the men whom he himself appoints as his agents. If in a constituency of 30,000 or 40,000 people, who perhaps become highly excited around election time, the candidate is to be responsible for everything that is done on his behalf, he will be helpless. Does the minister, in this proposed legislation, describe what constitutes an agent, or is everybody who supports the candidate an agent?

Mr. DOHERTY: The courts have devoted a good deal of time and attention to the question of what constitutes agency under the Election Act, and I think that they have arrived at a fairly settled jurisprudence. I must say that I would not venture myself to give an adequate definition, which could be so compressed as to be inserted in the statute, to cover all the conditions under which a man may be held to be the agent of another. It has been pointed out that there is this very substantial objection to the amendment suggested: It is true that we have gone very far, in the interests of the purity of elections, in depriving the candidate elected of the honour and the right of retaining the seat in the operation of electing him to which there has been any material degree of corruption. So far, we deprive him of the seat and set aside the choice of the people to that extent. What the hon. member for St. John suggests is that we should now go a step further and foist upon the people for the future, as their representative, a man whom, as by their votes they have made perfectly clear, they do not want. The effect of the amendment would be to penalize the people of the constituency because by some accident the election of the man for whom they voted in preponderating majority is declared void. The people, as a whole, are not responsible for that. As I understand it, in the cases where a man is entitled to claim the seat because his adversary was not qualified to be a candidate, so careful are the courts of the right of the people not to have somebody put upon them whom they have declared that they do not want, that they require that it shall be shown that the voters, when they went to vote for the unqualified man, knew that they were voting for an unqualified man, and were intentionally and deliberately throwing their votes away. If I am not mistaken, where you claim a seat because your adversary was not qualified to be nominated, you are not entitled to get more than an annulment of election, unless in addition to showing that he was not qualified to be a candidate, you establish that the people generally knew, or ought to have known, that you had called it to their attention so that it may be said that they ought to have known and must have known that they were voting for an unqualified person, and then you get the seat because the court says the people of the constituency, with their eyes open, chose to throw away their votes. But I am not aware of a case under our Dominion Elections Act of this kind. I do know a case, not by virtue of specific statutes but in the contestation of a municipal election, of something of this kind. I had occasion to deal with one myself in the course of my judicial experience, and there I decided, and the judgment was confirmed, that though it was perfectly apparent that the candidate for whom the majority voted was not qualified to be a candidate for the office at all, and though the seat was claimed by his adversary, the minority candidate, who was perfectly qualified, the court, before it would be entitled to adjudge the seat to the minority candidate, should be able to say something more than that the elected man was not qualified—should be able to say that the electors, with their eyes open, threw their votes away when they voted for him.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would call the minister's attention to the case of Baird and King in Queens county, in which the returning officer declared that the receipt for the $200 deposit required from the candidate was not in proper form. The election was

run, the people were perfectly innocent of any irregularity; there was a majority for Mr. King; yet the returning officer declared Mr. Baird elected and this House sustained the election of Mr. Baird, because, rightly or wrongly, they decided that there never was any other candidate.

Mr. DOHERTY: It was not a question of whether the candidate was qualified or wheather two men had or had not been nominated. I am not called upon to discuss that, as I understand the decision of the House went on the ground that only one man was legally nominated, who could be voted for. The case I was dealing with was the case of an unqualified person, and I only refer to it as showing the care with which the law proceeds before undertaking to say not only that the people shall not have a man for whom a majority voted, unless they choose him again, but also that they shall have a man with regard to whom it is absolutely manifest that they did not want him, that they had voted by an overwhelming majority that they did not want him. Are we going to impose such a man on the people because it happens that the other candidate or some agent or some other person who by a forced construction may be held to be the agent of the other candidate, was guilty of corrupt practice? While there is much to be said in favour of the view that an election is a fight between two candidates, we must bear in mind always the paramount right of the people to have in the first place the man they choose, and above all not to have forced on them a man whom they have repudiated. For these reasons it would be impossible to accept the amendment.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Sevigny in the chair.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I was going to say one or two words in reply to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and also in reply to the remarks made by the right hon. the Prime Minister, and in doing so I want to admit fully that I realize the force of the objection that is made from the standpoint of the constituency. But the question is whether the evil that is sought to be remedied is such as to warrant Parliament in making the provision I propose. As I said before, we must all admit that no remedy has been found so far for electoral corruption. Notwithstanding all the severe measures which have been passed during the last forty years there has been no change in that practice. Corruption in elections prevails to an extent as great as, if not greater, than ever before. If we think that this amendment would have the effect of inducing purity of elections, then the question fairly arises as to whether or not the benefits that would result would more than counteract any evil which might ensue with regard to the representation of the constituency in Parliament. The objection is made, with a great deal of force in it, that there may not be very extensive corruption by the friends and supporters of the elected candidate. If that is a real, substantial objection it might be got over by providing that the result which my amendment aims to accomplish would only be achieved in case of the judges finding that there had been a pretty general system of corruption, using the language contained in another part of the statute, in the interest of the elected candidate. I think everybody would admit that if the finding was to that extent it would not be a very great evil to return a man who had run a pure election free from all corrupt practices whatever.

Mr. TURGEON: I wish to say a word in approval of the amendment brought in by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). It is not quite as drastic a measure as I would like to see adopted by this Parliament. I would rather accept the suggestion of the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) that the agent of corruption should be brought into court immediately and punished, if found guilty on the evidence of a few honest witnesses. Meanwhile the amendment of my hon. friend from St. John will certainly have a tendency to raise the political morals of our people and to create a certain terror in the minds of those men who so flagrantly violate the law at election times. It is not only on election day or at the polls that unlawful acts are committed, but they are committed, particularly in the rural districts, as everybody knows, the night and day before election. These men will ride in automobiles during the night in the back settlements, and strangers will go in to interview the voter while the local man who has taken them remains in the automobile. He is not a witness of what takes place between the strangers and the voters. When the voters who have been subjected to this influence come down to the polls next morning it is found that they have

changed their political views. I think that this amendment will have a great effect upon the morals of our people, and that these political agents will not be as presumptious as they have been in the past.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I listened with a great deal of interest to the observations of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) this afternoon. Assuming, as we will, that we are all desirous of doing something to counteract the evils that are so prevalent, it does not appear to me that the amendment proposed will accomplish that object. We in Western Canada are situated in a very peculiar way. We have no lists in Alberta and in addition to that we propose to swear votes in on election day. That has been done for the last fifteen years. If we are going to lessen corruption we must start at the beginning and ask first: What is the object of an election? The whole idea of an election is to ascertain the will of democracy. To ascertain the will of the democracy the electors must not be fettered, corrupted or restrained. There must be a free expression of the opinion of the electors. How can that be accomplished? We know there is corruption, we know that the electors are corrupted, we know it, we believe it. Two plans were proposed in days gone by; one was compulsory voting and the other was the disfranchisement of the constituency. In addition to that we have had punishment of the individual by the unseating of the successful candidate if the election has been won by fraudulent means. My old preceptor, than whom no abler man ever sat in this Parliament, I venture to say, Dean Weldon, of Dalhousie University, introduced legislation looking to a solution of the same problems as those which have been referred to by the hon. member for St. John. His Bill was finally passed and incorporated into the statutes. We have made certain provisions for disfranchising individuals who have been guilty of corrupt acts. I do not think that at the present time we are prepared for the disfranchisement of constituencies. Compulsory voting has not been adopted in this country and we have never been successful in enforcing the statute as it is. I think we might do something in the way of disfranchising constituencies. If the judges were to report to Parliament that a general system of corruption pervaded an election and prevailed through a constituency I do believe that the best way for you to deal with it would be by disfranchising that constituency for the rest of the term of Parliament and holding it up to the people of Canada as an example of what corruption might accomplish. That would do something. Many years ago I entertained the idea, and I think I entertain it now more strongly than ever, that we must have a public prosecutor if we are going to accomplish any great amount of good under the present election law. In the different provinces there must be some such officers as a supervisor of elections and a public prosecutor. Electoral corruption is practised on such a scale that an individual cannot accomplish any good. I remember a general election in the West in which they were paying half-breed scrip. There was only one candidate for the whole province of Alberta, and the entire machinery of the Federal Government was at work paying scrip to thousands of individuals on election day. I remember that a telegraphic message was sent out something like this: "Majority large enough; stop the voting." That sort of thing cannot be overcome by single individuals. You require to have something more. You must have a public prosecutor who will make it his business, untrammelled by any consideration other than the public weal and the public good, to see that the laws are enforced. We do not need any new laws. The laws now in some respects are too drastic. Take the horse-hiring provision. That feature of the election law has become ridiculous because every one knows that horses are hired in every constituency from one end of Canada to the other. These trivial things are magnified into important things that have the effect of minimizing the advantages of the law as a whole. The amendment proposes what? Take the constituency of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), which that hon. gentleman represents here by a majority of something like 2,500 votes. Let us assume that the election was not run as an absolutely clean election and that three or four, half a dozen or a dozen of his agents, had been guilty of wrong doing and had violated the provisions of the election law; do you mean to say that it would be an advantage to this democracy to have that seat given to Col. Griesbach rather than a fresh appeal to the electors?

Will that make for any improvement? Is it not a very thwarting of the will of the people? One-half the electors and twenty-five hundred more decided that they desired to support the principles of the

Liberal party, and that one-half the electors and twenty-five hundred more are to be represented in Parliament by an opponent of the Liberal party and their principles because twenty-five men were guilty of corruption. Would that be right, or just, or fair? Is it not doing the very thing you should not do, namely, thwarting the very will of democracy? Is it not interposing against the will of democracy the corrupt views of twenty-five men? That is what it gets down to in the ultimate analysis. Why should twenty-five or one hundred corrupt men send to this Parliament a representative opposed to the wishes of the majority of the democracy in that constituency? I am certain that the proposal of the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) is not going to accomplish any good, and I think my hon. friend, with his large experience, will admit that. It is, as a gentleman in the Press Gallery said to me this evening, an endeavour to utilize the political machinery rather than the legal machinery to accomplish good, and there is a good deal to be said for that. What you cannot accomplish by the enforcement of law, sometimes you can accomplish by political considerations, and that is what this amendment would mean. In other words, as I apprehend the amendment, you would say to the people of the constituency of St. John, for example: If you are corrupt and take bribes for the purpose of electing the hon. gentleman who now represents that constituency, you will find yourselves represented in the next Parliament by an opponent of the Liberal Government—the constituency will be represented by an opponent of the Liberal Government in any event—and that is what it would mean. That cannot be a sound principle.

The endeavour of the committee was not to make new law, but to make effective the provisions of the law as they stand. The subject was too large to be dealt with in a week, or a month, or in several months. It would involve going over the old well-marked path, dealing with the question of compulsory voting, supervision of elections, public prosecutors, proper franchise, and matters of that kind. We simply had to deal with the situation as best we could, and the chairman of the committee outlined what the committee should undertake, and the committee has undertaken to suggest legislation that will make the existing laws more effective. Every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the other side of the House has admitted that probably to some extent the committee has succeeded in that. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) were strongly in favour of certain changes which they conceived would bring about certain well-desired results, and these are incorporated in the Bill. The committee has decided that if you will remove preliminary objections, and if you will make it impossible to tie up proceedings for a length of time by technical objections and delays in the courts, you will have accomplished much good. That, this legislation will do.

I very much fear that the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) is desiring to make light of this whole endeavour of the committee to improve conditions, and that he really does not seriously believe in his amendment, because he must see that its effect would be to nullify and destroy such good as we are endeavouring to accomplish by the Bill submitted. I think it will be found that simplicity, effectiveness, and efficiency, will be secured by the proposal now submitted to the House, and which has met with very general approval. It will, we believe, be a distinct improvement on existing conditions, and in addition, it will be found that instead of endeavouring to make new laws and create new offences we have simply taken advantage of existing conditions in the law as it now stands, to introduce simpler machinery into the statute-book for the purpose of making it more effective. I think we have succeeded in doing that.

If one were to generalize and philosophize on the question of corruption in the broader sense, how corruption is brought about and why, and whether the publication of contributions to election funds might not accomplish much good, one could do so, but these questions have engaged the attention of the House on former occasions, and we could not accomplish much good by discussing them now. We in the province of Alberta must first of all have a Franchise Act, and we must have some finality to our lists. We must endeavour in that new country to pass laws which will charge some one individual with responsibility for the enforcement of the law regardless of cost and regardless of consequences. I would point out that in my province, forty men who cannot speak the English or the French languages, who are foreign in every sense to our traditions and who know nothing of our history and nothing of the subjects under consideration,

absolutely controlled the representation of at least one constituency, and that a similar number of such men controlled the representation of two or three other constituencies in the local legislature in the two new provinces. I think that our new Naturalization Act will do something to prevent that evil, but corruption can only be killed by making those who practise it pay the penalty of it. I do think that the legislation which is submitted in this Bill will do a little towards that end.

We all know that some corruption is practised in the election of the very best of men. As my hon. friend was speaking this afternoon, I was thinking of what John Morley tells of Gladstone's first election in Newark, that when he found the enormous expense of that election he was so disconcerted about it that he, for a time, contemplated the possibility of giving up his seat. Times have changed in England, and I doubt not that the right hon. gentleman opposite, who has seen so many parliaments come and go, and who spoke this afternoon about the changes wrought in the law about the time he came into this House would be able to tell us, were he in a philosophic frame of mind, that there has been at least an improvement in public opinion, as reflected in this House in its attitude towards corruption. The body politic may not have made as much improvement, for the simple reason that on account of large operations being carried on in this new country there is a tendency on the part, not of the people themselves, but on the part of those who have benefits to derive from governments to bring about corruption. Were this the proper time I might a tale unfold, by discussing that. I do not think that the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman, anxious though he may be to see some improvement, will bring about good; I do not think that any such measure as will thwart the will of the majority, and place the well-being of the people as a whole in the several constituencies in the hands of twenty-five or thirty corrupt electors, by sending to Parliament a man who is not the choice of the electors, can, in any sense, be said to be a remedy for something for which we must find a remedy, and which can only be found in clean, decent franchise, well-settled lists, a public prosecutor, and supervision of elections by some responsible authority, so that no financial considerations will prevent the law, as it now stands, from being rigorously and vigorously enforced. Beyond that I think we must look to the future and go slowly, being willing to make a little progress from day to day, realizing that such improvements as they have made in England, and in the republic to the south of us, have come slowly but have come surely and inevitably.

Mr. McCRANEY: I would like to believe that the proposed amendments or any other amendments to the election law would result in any very great change in the conduct of elections and in the purifying of the public life of this country. Twenty-five or thirty years ago election petitions used to be fought out. They are not fought out to-day; they are traded away, the reason for that being that there has come a feeling of complacency over the public. The public feel that it is an even fight; that the chances of election are as good on the one side as on the other; that when an election is over at five o'clock on election night, they had better get the result and go home, and that it is unsportsmanlike to challenge the other fellow's seat and try to get one's own candidate in. I think I am expressing a view that is very generally held.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Especially in the West.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The West is not an exception to the rule.

Mr. McCRANEY: I have lived in the East and I have noticed that view quite as much in the East as in the West; in fact, I have seen more evidences of tampering with the voter in the East than I have in the West. My experience of elections in the West is that the voter, as a rule, is not corrupt, although immense sums of money are expended. We have a provision that a candidate for Parliament shall publish an account of his election expenses within a certain time after the date of the poll, and we all publish those statements. Those statements are asked for with a view of obtaining the amount expended by each candidate and of curtailing the amount, it being felt that by the public knowledge which is gained there may be less corruption carried on. I am quite safe, however, in saying that the statement published by a candidate, either successful or unsuccessful, contains no information of the character which is intended; that it gives a person who reads the statement no idea whatsoever of the moneys used in the conduct of the election, and that for any purposes

of that kind we might abolish the statement altogether and realize at once that by that means at any rate no information can be arrived at.

My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) spoke of the desirability of having a public prosecutor, and he has gone along the right line. The law as it stands is good enough if it is enforced. I am not objecting to having amendments; I am only saying that the same practice will continue whether you amend the law or not. When I was living in eastern Canada, I resided in the county of my hon. friend the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). In the provincial election of 1898, Mr. John R. Barber was the successful candidate against Mr. William Kerns. An election petition was filed and the protest came for trial. Before the trial it was decided by Mr. Barber's friends that he should give up the seat, and that sufficient admissions should be made to void his election. There were two judges as the election trial judges; and when the attempt was made to throw the seat open in that way by admissions, the judges said: "No, we will not let you do it in that way; you are bound to prove that there was general corruption throughout the constituency; we are not going to throw open the constituency by consent; you must bring your evidence." Therefore evidence was put in on behalf of the petitioners showing that in many polling divisions corruption had been carried on; in fact I recall that the information in some cases was supplied by the respondent, because it was a consent arrangement, but it had to be gone through with and the election was voided. On the report of the judges, the late Mr. William Lount, who was afterwards one of the High Court judges of Ontario, was appointed public prosecutor. The fact that Mr. Lount's political sympathies were those of the respondent made no difference whatever. He came to the county of Halton; he made his investigations; he made his prosecutions, and quite a number of those who were reported by the election trial judges were subsequently prosecuted by Mr. Lount and fined. Whoever paid the fines I do not know; but the prosecutions carried on at that time by Mr. Lount as public prosecutor under the direction of the Attorney General had a very salutary effect in the county of Halton, and I think if such a suggestion as that made by my hon. friend from Calgary were carried out and in each province some counsel were appointed—he would have to have very high standing so as to command public confidence—there would be such a shaking-up that perhaps corruption might be limited in some degree. I am not disposed to think that all the corruption is amongst the foreign element or the poorer classes of the people; very often it is high up. One of the reasons that we have corruption in our public life is the penalty which we put upon the man who is a candidate for Parliament or who is a member of Parliament or a member of the Cabinet, if he loses his seat. In the Old Country if a man loses his seat, he can get another seat; but he cannot do that here; if he loses his seat, he is down and out. There are very strong temptations in this country for a man who wishes to remain in public life to let those things be done which will ensure his success.

Amendment (Mr. Pugsley) negatived

On section 13—right to appeal on preliminary objections, etc., omitted:

Mr. DOHERTY: The only change effected by this amendment is eliminating from the provisions of the law as they now stand references to appeal on preliminary objections.

Section agreed to.

On section 14—substitution of new petitioner:

Mr. DOHERTY: The change under this section is that instead of its being necessary for the applicant for substitution as petitioner to make his application to the court for leave to be substituted in the case of the withdrawal of the petitioner, provision is now made simply for the publication of an advertisement, and that a new petitioner may be substituted by filing in the court within one month from the last publication of the advertisement, or within such longer period as the court may prescribe, a notice of substitution in the form C in the schedule of this Act. Whereas under the old law it was provided that such party coming in to be substituted should give security as the original one did, and that in cases where there was reason to suspect any fraudulent connivance in connection with the withdrawal, the original deposit should remain as security, the provision here is that in all cases the original deposit shall remain as security.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In cases where an elected member had reason to believe

that his election would be protested, it has been known to happen that the elected member got a friend to issue the petition, and, the matter then being practically in the hands of the elected member, the petition was not proceeded with and the matter became a dead letter at once. I do not know whether there is in the law as it is to-day a provision under which any elector may interfere in such cases by asking to be made a party to the suit in order that the petition may be brought to trial.

Mr. DOHERTY: Section 37 of the Act is as follows:

When, under this Act, more petitions than one are presented relating to the same election or return, all such petitions shall, in the election list, be bracketed together, and shall be dealt with, as far as may be, as one petition; but such petitions shall stand in the election list in the place where the last presented of them would have stood if it had been the only one presented, as to such election or return, unless the court otherwise orders.

So that all petitions filed are combined and tried together as though they were one, coming in the order of the last one on the list.

Mr. PROULX: Is it not possible, because of the fact that no time is fixed within which the clerk shall advertise, that there may be some delay in the proceedings?

Mr. DOHERTY: The provision is that upon any petitioner dying, becoming incompetent or being authorized to withdraw, notice shall be given by the clerk of the court. Immediately upon any of these things taking place, notice shall be given.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister made any estimate of how long it will take under this procedure to bring an election petition to trial?

Mr. DOHERTY: The respondent has 15 days within which to file his answer to the petition, and, if he does not file that answer, he is taken to have denied everything. Then, within 15 days after that, either party may apply to the court to fix a date for the trial. If at the expiry of the thirty days neither party has done so, it will be the duty of the clerk to call the attention of the court to that fact, and it will be the duty of the court, after giving notice to the parties, to fix a proper time and place for the trial. I should say, therefore, that within six weeks after the forty days—two months, at all events—the petition ought to be brought to trial.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there an appeal on the merits of the case from the decision of the judges?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, there is provision for an appeal from the final judgment.

Section agreed to.

On section 16—witnesses to be summoned, and by whom:

Mr. DOHERTY: This provision has relation to the summary trial of corrupt practices at elections. The officer charged with the prosecution is, under the present law, bound to summon such witnesses as gave material evidence at the trial, and, in addition such witnesses as he deems requisite. Under this present provision there is imposed upon the prosecuting officer the obligation to summon such witnesses who deposed to any fact material to the charge as the trial judges may deem necessary or desirable to have subpœnaed, and such other witnesses as he thinks requisite to prove the charges. The only change, therefore, is that the prosecuting officer, in addition to his obligation to subpœna such witnesses as he may deem necessary, is bound to subpœna any witnesses that the judge at the trial may indicate as being desirable witnesses.

Section agreed to.

On section 17—punishment of convicted offenders:

Mr. DOHERTY: The only change is a provision making it clear that the penalty provided in this section is in addition to the disqualification provided for by section 282 of the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there anything in this law or in the proposed amendment to prevent a railway company from carrying liquor at election time into a county where its sale is entirely prohibited?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is not in this Bill any special provision with regard to their carrying liquor at election time.

Mr. MARCIL: For a distance of 500 miles along the shore of the St. Lawrence, from Lévis to Gaspé basin, there are no licensed saloons. What I want to know is whether the Government railway or any other railway may carry any quantity of liquor into these districts, to be distributed and used for election purposes.

Mr. DOHERTY: It seems to me that a railway company distributing liquor in a

prohibition county would be violating the law just as anybody else would. Of course, the Government railway would not do this; in any case, I do not see that there is any difference between the man travelling on the railway and distributing liquor in a prohibition town, and any other man doing the same thing.

Mr. MARCIL: In ten or twelve counties in the district which I have mentioned there are no licensed saloons, and if there is no provision to prevent a railway company from carrying liquor into these districts as ordinary freight at election times, and distributing it to be used by either political party for election purposes, I suggest that the minister give the matter consideration. There is a law now to prohibit the carrying of liquor in Scott Act counties, and I know that prosecutions under that law have taken place in the province of New Brunswick.

An hon. MEMBER: But the law is not enforced.

Mr. HAZEN: Any law may be evaded, but the penalty is there.

Mr. MARCIL: These are not Scott Act counties. The people simply refuse to have licenses.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are counties where an individual would be free to give away liquor. The question is whether a railway company should be subject to some special prohibition that would not apply to an individual.

Mr. MARCIL: But do you not think it would be wise to prohibit the carrying of liquor to these constituencies for a month before and a fortnight after the election?

Mr. DOHERTY: That would be a subject for amendment of the Dominion Elections Act rather than the Controverted Elections Act.

I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why should we rise and report progress without some statement of when we are to meet again?

Mr. DOHERTY: I thought it was desired that further consideration should be given to sections 4, 5 and 10.

Mr. MACLEAN: I wanted that explanation.

Progress reported.

[Mr. Doherty.]

CANADA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill No. 112, to amend the Canada Grain Act—Sir George Foster—was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1:

Section 27 of the Canada Grain Act, chapter 27 of the statute of 1912, is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

"2. Such certicate shall be in all cases prima facie evidence of the facts therein contained."

Mr. OLIVER: I understood from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) that the Bill coming from the Senate was not to be proceeded with.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister intends to proceed with the Bill; I am aware of that. He waited all afternoon with the hope of being able to proceed. It is his desire that it should go through to-night. The section read so far is in the form in which the minister wishes it to pass.

Mr. OLIVER: There is a misunderstanding somewhere. I understood from the minister that he was not going to proceed with this Bill, and to-day he handed me a typewritten copy which I understood him to say was to be substituted for the Bill coming from the Senate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman misunderstood. The Bill coming from the Senate is to be proceeded with. What he has is a typewritten copy of two clauses which are to be added by way of amendment to the Bill as it comes from the Senate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Would the Solicitor General say what is the effect of this clause?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The certificate referred to in this clause is the inspecting officer's certificate as to grade. Hitherto, the Act has stood in this form, that the waymaster's certificate as to weight is prima facie evidence, but there has been no clause giving evidential value to the certificate of the grade. This gives it evidential value—makes it prima facie evidence as to grade.

On section 2—official certificate of weight:

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has a typewritten copy of the proposed amendment. I move that section 2 be amended so as to read:

No grain shall leave a terminal elevator without being officialy weighed, and the official

certificate of weight shall be final, subject to the provisions of section 120 of this Act.

The effect will be to make the official weight certificate—not the certificate as to grade, but that as to weight—final, subject to re-investigation, which re-investigation is provided for by section 120 of the Grain Act. This will make the weigh-
9 p.m. master's certificate conclusive evidence of the weight of the grain, but it may be reviewed by the Grain Commissioner, but not by any other tribunal.

Mr. ROBB: Does this apply to harbour elevators in Montreal?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member will look at section 118—I speak from memory—he will see that it provides that Part II of the Act shall apply only to elevators in the western division and to public elevators in the eastern division in so far as they carry western grain. By a subsequent clause public elevators include terminal elevators. Consequently, strictly speaking, this would apply to eastern elevators in so far as they carry western grain. But as a matter of practice it has never been made so to apply, because it has not been the practice to have weighmasters under the Grain Commission in these eastern elevators as in the others. Consequently it cannot take effect unless weighmasters are appointed.

Mr. ROBB: The point I want to make is that the weighmaster appointed by the Harbour Commission of Montreal would, under the section proposed, naturally come under the supervision of the Grain Commission, who have nothing to do with engaging him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the weighmaster appointed by the Harbour Commission of Montreal would not be such a "weighmaster" as is contemplated in the section. The "weighmasters" herein referred to are appointed by the Grain Commission; and until the Grain Commission appoints "weighmasters" for the eastern elevators, which I understand is not intended, this section can have no application.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move the following amendment on section 3:

Section 118 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following words: "and to all water-carriers other than ocean carriers."

Section 118 is the section which I quoted to the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb); it is the definition section. The effect of adding those words to it is to make clear that part 2 is applicable to carriers between the western elevators and the eastern elevators, in so far as they carry western grain only.

Mr. GERMAN: That would cover United States ships going from Port Arthur to Buffalo?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; the vessels to which the hon. gentleman refers do not carry grain from the western division to the eastern elevators.

Section agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move that the following be added as section 4:

The said Act is further amended by adding after section 120, the following sections:

120a. The board shall also receive and investigate all complaints in writing under oath, of any shortage in grain upon the delivery of same from an elevator to a vessel or from a vessel to an elevator, and shall have power to assess or apportion the loss arising from such shortage, amongst the elevator operators, water-carriers, and shippers, having to do with the said grain, and the finding of the board and such assessment or apportionment certified over the hand of a majority of the board, shall be delivered or sent to all persons concerned in such finding, assessment or apportionment, and shall be final and shall be enforceable in any court of competent jurisdiction.

120b. The board may make regulations governing the responsibility for and the disposition of shortages and overages of grain upon delivery of same from an elevator to a vessel or from a vessel to an elevator, and may assess in such manner and in such amount as it may deem just and proper, contributions from elevator operators, water-carriers and shippers, or from any of them, in favour of the board or otherwise, for the purpose of providing against such responsibility.

Provided that nothing contained in this section shall limit the powers of the board under the preceding section.

This is undoubtedly important legislation. I believe the minister has already reviewed in the House the circumstances that have given rise to it. A conflict has arisen between the lake carriers and the western shippers the lake carriers endeavouring to put into effect a form of bill of lading which would have turned back upon the shippers the entire responsibility for any shortages that might occur during transit from the western elevators to the eastern elevators. Heretofore there has been no special regulation governing it. Some of the companies have found themselves at the end of the year loaded with considerable loss by reason of shortages, the shortage arising by virtue of lesser weight being

given to the carrier when he went to deliver this grain to the eastern elevator for transhipment to ocean steamers or to elevators at Kingston for transference to barges and thence to ocean steamers, than the weight given him by the Government certificate out of the western elevator. Similarly other carriers had what are called overages by the reverse process, that is the eastern weight was greater than the western weight. The result has been that a very determined effort has been made to get from under this responsibility and a conflict of interests has arisen. An effort has been made to bring the parties together, but I understand without final success. The intention of this legislation is to enable the board to provide against two classes of cases, the only cases that can arise. The first one is the class of cases where it is possible for the board, by investigation of the facts, to fix the responsibility for the shortage, to say to the western elevator operator: You have made an error, we have power under section 120a to investigate particularly questions of shortages and overages and we find that the error is on your part and therefore we say to you you must be responsible for the error, you must pay. Similarly they would have power to fix the responsibiliy on the lake carrier wherever the evidence was on hand which convinced them that the lake carrier was at fault; and likewise they would have power to fix the responsibility on the eastern elevator. Another class of cases also arises, that is where there is no evidence available to enable the tribunal, which will be the Grain Commission, to fix responsibility anywhere. That, I understand, is a very frequent occurrence. Cases arise very often where it is a matter of utter impossibility to bring home responsibility to the western weighmaster or to the eastern weighmaster or to the lake carrier. What is to be done with such cases as that? Obviously a solution can be found only along the line of a permanent regulation which may fix the responsibility always upon one party and fix a scale of contributions by which the other two parties also interested in the same grain, and who perhaps may be responsible, shall in every case contribute to a fund that shall be used by way of assurance against the loss which the class who are fixed with permanent responsibility in such cases will have to bear. It will be observed that 120a provides that they may and must investigate the facts upon any complaint of shortage or overage. They have the power, if the facts brought before the commission are sufficient to justify its exercise, to determine who shall stand the loss of the shortage and who shall get the benefit of the overage. But they have also power under 120b to make such regulations as may be required for governing the disposition of these shortages and overages. They may make regulations assessing against any one of the three, or indeed the four parties, for the shippers are the fourth parties, any scale of contribution, that scale of contribution being made to the board or to any one of the parties. The words used are: "Being made to the board or otherwise," and that scale is fixed as against the party by whom the contribution is to be made and against the party who is to be held to consistent responsibility for the loss.

Mr. ROBB: While the Solicitor General says that the board will have power to investigate under oath all complaints in writing of shortages in grain, will he tell us what is to be done about overages? I will give him a case. Early in October last there was a vessel loaded at three different elevators at Fort William. When the ship reached port at the Georgian Bay end of the route there was an overage of 10,000 bushels reported. Word was sent back to Fort William, and immediately one of the men said: That is my grain; I made the mistake. But as they traced it along a little farther it was found that the overage was not in the hold loaded at that particular elevator, but in another hold. How will they trace that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see how an overage could occur at one point unless there was a shortage at another. It seems that it will be necessary to complain as to a shortage.

Mr. ROBB: The shortage would perhaps only be discovered in the elevator at the end of the season.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but before it is discovered there has to be a complaint as to the shortage. No man is going to complain of an overage. The man to whom the overage accrues is the man who benefits. Unless somebody complains of a shortage there could scarcely be any call upon the board to interfere. The case that my hon. friend referred to would arise and come before the board only if a shortage had existed causing the ultimate overage and was complained of. If the word "overage" were to be inserted, it would mean the recasting

of the whole clause, and I do not see that the clause would be improved thereby, or that it would cover any real case that is not covered by the clause as it is.

Mr. ROBB: I am not a lawyer, and I do not know anything about that. What I want to find out is how they are going to take evidence under oath. That case actually happened last fall, and there were three different elevators interested.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They might take evidence under oath on any complaint, but they cannot assess as for overage because there is no loss. Somebody will have to lose before there will be a complaint. This empowers them to assess against loss. They cannot do that unless there is a loss. I think if my hon. friend would agree to leave the clause as it is, he will find that there is no case that can arise that will not be covered by it.

Mr. OLIVER: Would section 120b make provision for the case mentioned by my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Robb)? It says that:

The board may make regulations governing the responsibility for and the disposition of shortage and overages of grain upon the delivery of grain from an elevator to a vessel or from a vessel to an elevator.

Mr. ROBB: Could they take evidence under oath?

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. member asks could the evidence under section 120b be taken under oath.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 120 provides, subclause 2, that "for the purpose of such investigation the board shall have power to summon witnesses." It strikes me that to make certain they can summon witnesses and investigate under oath for the purposes of these two clauses, which certainly they must have power to do, it might be well to add after the words "such investigation" in subclause 2 of section 120, the words, "or any investigation authorized under this Act." It may be that they have a general power, but if they had there would be no reason for putting in subclause 2 of section 120. Subclause 2 has stood in that way since the Act was passed.

Mr. OLIVER: Do I understand the Solicitor General to make the suggestion that there should be such a provision added?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I think it should be added to subsection 2 of section 120.

Mr. OLIVER: That would cover the point raised by my hon. friend from Huntingdon?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I think the point is covered by section 120b. In an investigation under both clauses they could take the evidence under oath. They have power to investigate overages under section 120b. They cannot investigate complaints of overages, because there could be no complaints; consequently it would not do to include overages in 120a.

New sections 120a and 120b agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move that a clause be added reading as follows:

Subsection 2 of section 120 of the said Act is amended by adding, after the word "investigation," in the first line thereof, the words, "or of any investigation authorized under this Act."

Mr. OLIVER: While I do not offer objection to these amendments, because I have no doubt they are the best that can be put forward at the present time, I would like to point out that in their nature they are very indefinite as to where the responsibility is to rest amongst the different parties who handle the grain. The authority and the responsibility is placed upon the Board of Grain Commissioners to find out the particulars if a certain occurrence takes place, and probably that is the best that can be done at the moment, but my opinion is that there should have been a more thorough examination into the conditions surrounding the shipment of grain, and that the amendment to the Act should be so framed as to, so far as possible, place the responsibility directly upon the parties to the transaction. It seems to me that the tendency of his declaration is to say to the shipper, the carrier, the receiver, and the dealer: if you can get by with a shortage you are welcome to do so, it is up to the Board to adjust the matter amongst all the parties concerned. That seems to me to be hardly a satisfactory principle, but I understand the difficulties of the situation and I do not find fault with the proposal now made to remedy these difficulties. The principle is hardly the best principle, according to my judgment, and probably with the experience that may come through the exercise of the authority now vested in the Board of Grain Commissioners, at a later date it may be possible to embody the other principle which I think is very much to be preferred.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This is a very technical Bill and before it is submitted for a third reading I think it should be reprinted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well.

SUPPLY.

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

Public Works—Brantford new public building, $25,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What will be the cost of this new building?

Mr. ROGERS: $225,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the population of Brantford?

Mr. ROGERS: 30,000.

Mr. MARCIL: For what purpose is the building to be used?

Mr. ROGERS: Post office, customs, inland revenue.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the $225,000 include the site?

Mr. ROGERS: No, this is for the building alone.

Brussels public building, $22,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the population of Brussels?

Mr. ROGERS: 1,100.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the cost of the building?

Mr. ROGERS: The contract is not let yet. We will keep the cost within the Estimate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the estimated cost?

Mr. ROGERS: About $20,000, outside of the site.

Burford public building, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where is Burford situated, and what is the population?

Mr. ROGERS: In Brant. The population of the district to be served by this public building is 4,000.

Cannington public building, $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the population? I thought I had put public buildings in all the important towns in Ontario.

Mr. ROGERS: You evidently overlooked Cannington. It is a place of over 1,000 population. It is an important town.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Eganville public building, $10,000.

Mr. PROULX: Is it the intention of the minister to go on with this work this year?

Mr. ROGERS: This appropriation finished the building.

Mr. PROULX: On which side of the river is this building?

Mr. ROGERS: On the south side.

Mr. PROULX: Then it is in North Renfrew?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know.

Mr. PROULX: The main portion of the village is in South Renfrew.

Mr. G. V. WHITE: My hon. friend should look at the last census.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The fact about this building is that the appropriation was put in by me for a building in the constituency of South Renfrew, and the building was switched off to the other side of the river and put into the other constituency after this Government came into power.

Mr. G. V. WHITE: I am afraid my hon. friend did not even purchase the site.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He provided the money.

Mr. WHITE: He simply said that the building was for Eganville; he did not state on which side of the river it was to be situated.

Exeter public building, $15,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Where is Exeter situated?

Mr. ROGERS: In South Huron.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the population?

Mr. ROGERS: 1,792.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the cost of this public building?

Mr. ROGERS: We have not started it yet; the plans have not been made. We will endeavour to keep it within the estimate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Many of these items are re-votes.

Mr. ROGERS: All re-votes.

Galt drill hall, $30,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the cost of that?

Mr. ROGERS: Fifty-odd thousand dollars.

Mr. PARDEE: Are they at work on it?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister a statement of the number of drill halls being erected in Ontario?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not.

Mr. McCRANEY: On Saturday evening I asked if the minister had an estimate of the votes included here which he intended to go on with this year. He had not such a statement then; has he got it now?

Mr. ROGERS: That would be very difficult to arrive at, for I am not in a position to know what votes will be expended during the present year. I cannot give such a statement off-hand, and I doubt if I could give it even if I had time to consider the matter.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the minister waiting for in order to arrive at a decision?

Mr. ROGERS: Partly for the termination of the war.

Mr. MARCIL: There are certain places where the work is commenced. Is the minister waiting for more revenue, or what?

Mr. ROGERS: That is one thing; we are waiting for more revenue.

Mr. ROBB: The question was asked by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) about drill halls in Ontario. I may, perhaps, enlighten him a little. I checked over the list, and I find that this year the minister is providing for 183 public buildings and 41 new drill halls throughout Canada. Of that number 63 public buildings and 15 drill halls are in Ontario.

Mr. ROGERS: Thank you.

Mr. MARCIL: Are these drill halls built at the request of the Militia Department?

Mr. ROGERS: Entirely.

Mr. MARCIL: The Department of Public Works exercises no control—simply complies with the request of the Militia Department?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. We have our architects make the plans, and we give some supervision to the cost and size.

Mr. PARDEE: Does the Militia Department decide on the cost of the drill halls?

Mr. ROGERS: Largely they do.

Mr. PARDEE: Then, it would be a good plan, while Estimates such as these are going through, that the Minister of Militia should be here to tell us why so many drill halls are necessary. I have taken a strong stand on this drill hall question, and I take it yet. In many cases this is a sheer waste of money. I believe we might save 90 per cent of what is spent on drill halls. That has been up in the House before, but, judging by the evidence now before us, the drill hall industry is still a flourishing one in Ontario. So far as I am concerned, I object to it most strenuously. These drill halls are put in places where the soldiers they are intended to accommodate are very few, not at all commensurate with the expense the country is put to in maintaining the drill hall.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sorry the Minister of Militia is not here at the moment. But my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) will remember that he raised this same point last year and the Estimates were delayed until the arrival of the Minister of Militia, who then gave a statement with respect to the various drill halls. There is no new item for a drill hall in the Estimates this year.

Mr. PARDEE: Well, the cure would likely be worse than the disease. Better let it go through as it is.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is to be borne in mind by the committee that the item for drill halls in the Estimates of the Minister of Public Works do not include all the drill halls, because in the Militia Department there were a number to be constructed at less than $50,000, if I remember the figures.

Mr. ROGERS: There is no such item, as I understand it, in the Militia Estimates this year.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Will the minister please inform us what he intends to do about the vote of $100,000 for new barracks in Montreal? I have seen that $100,000 voted many, many times, but I have not seen the commencement of the work, nor have I seen any indication of an intention to build a new barracks. What is the use of voting money every year only to keep it locked up in the treasury?

Mr. ROGERS: We have got the site; we have made that much progress with respect to the barracks at Montreal.

Mr. MARCIL: I would remind the committee of what happened last Saturday night. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) said that he had appealed strongly for the organization of a militia battalion for the town of Amherst. There is already a county battalion in existence.

But $108,000 is to be spent on a drill shed in Amherst. I can understand that in a town or city where there are to two or three regiments there must be a drill shed; but in a case like that of Amherst, where the application is merely pending, to spend $108,000 before the regiment is brought into existence is a rather reckless waste of public money.

Huntsville public building, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is quite an amount for Huntsville, is it not? What is its population? It is only a summer resort, as I understand.

Mr. ROGERS: No; the population according to the last census was 2,358. It is a thriving town. We pass through it on our way to Winnipeg going from Toronto, and judging by its looks it is quite an important town.

Ingersoll drill hall, $25,000.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: When the Estimates of the Department of Militia were under consideration last year, the Minister of Militia said that several of these drill halls were not used for military purposes. I think he made the statement that some of them were not intended to be used for military purposes, but that, in his estimation, they served a very useful purpose in enabling the young people—"youth and beauty" were his words, I think—of the country to gather together there in the evenings and have a social time. The minister seemed to think that these purposes were quite sufficient to justify the construction of buildings of this kind, and that, even if not used for military purposes, they were quite useful along these other lines. It is a question which the committee might consider at this time, whether under present circumstances money should be voted for these purposes, and whether it is intended to carry out this proposed expenditure. In fact, it was suggested at that time that kissing bees were held in these places.

Mr. ROGERS: Was that suggested in the committee?

Mr. HUGHES: Somebody in the committee used that expression, and it was not objected to. The Minister of Militia and Defence really gave that impression.

Mr. ROGERS: I wish my hon. friend would let us know where to find that in Hansard.

Mr. HUGHES: Many things are stated in committee that do not subsequently appear in Hansard. I remember the occasion quite distinctly, and I will look it up for my hon. friend. It was not put just in that way, but I remember the Minister of Militia making a statement and giving an explanation in regard to the matter, and expressing the opinion that it was quite right.

Mr. PROULX: I remember well that the minister said that these buildings were good places for the young boys and girls to meet, under proper control.

Public Works—London armoury, to enlarge site, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is a good deal of money for the enlargement of a site.

Mr. ROGERS: A very comprehensive plan is being arranged jointly with the city of London, which is a very important centre. This amount is in connection with the share of the Government towards the purchase of an additional site.

Mr. PARDEE: Will it be alongside the old site?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Millbrook public building, $10,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the population of Millbrook, and what is the total amount to be expended?

Mr. ROGERS: The population is about 1,000, and the cost of the building will be within the estimate of $20,000.

Milton public building, $20,000.

Mr. HENDERSON: Milton is the shire town of Halton, and a very important place of 2,000 odd population. The building is almost completed.

Napanee drill hall, $36,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What will this drill hall cost?

Mr. ROGERS: The contract was for $42,500, I believe. We have not spent all of the money.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the population of Napanee?

Mr. ROGERS: 2,807.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not the Minister think that $61,000 is a good deal for a drill hall for a town of 2,800 people? However, the building is under construction and we cannot do much now to stop it.

Mr. MARCIL: I presume the minister knows that there is no regiment there, only one or two companies of a county battalion.

Mr. ROGERS: This is the headquarters of the 47th Regiment.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister cannot say how many of them belong to Napanee?

Mr. ROGERS: It is the headquarters for the regiment, and they take advantage of the drill hall.

Mr. MARCIL: They meet there once a year, yes. I would have no objection if the regiment used it; but if there are only one or two companies who use a drill hall which costs $61,000, in hard times like this it seems extravagant.

Ottawa—Customs buildings, $600,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the same contractor the contract for the building proper as for the foundation?

Mr. ROGERS: No, the foundations were built by the Foundation Company of Montreal. The ironwork is being done by the Toronto Structural Steel Company.

Mr. MARCIL: Who has the contract for the building?

Mr. ROGERS: Lyall and Company.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the $600,000 be the total cost?

Mr. ROGERS: No, we will probably require something next year.

Mr. PROULX: Will that be used only for the Customs Examining Warehouse.

Mr. PUGSLEY: For Customs Examining Warehouse and for the offices of the whole Department of Customs.

Mr. PROULX: There will be no other department there.

Mr. ROGERS: That will depend on the amount of room available.

Ottawa—new drill hall, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has a site been acquired yet?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is that a second drill hall for Ottawa?

Mr. ROGERS: They have a very old one here on Cartier square that is about played out.

Ottawa — Parliament and departmental buildings—re-wiring, etc., $70,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is anything to be done for the library this year?

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid not. If we are delaying any particular work, I think that will have to stand for the present year.

Own Sound—drill hall, $25,000.

Mr. MARCIL: How much will this cost?

Mr. ROGERS: About $50,000.

Palmerston public building, $38,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the population of Palmerston?

Mr. ROGERS: 1,850.

Mr. PARDEE: What is this public building to be used for?

Mr. ROGERS: Post office, customs and inland revenue.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What will be the total cost?

Mr. ROGERS: The contract is for $30,770.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You have gone over that, with last year's expenditure it is $43,000.

Mr. ROGERS: That includes the fittings and sidewalks, etc.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is a pretty expensive building for a place of 1,800 people. I think myself, as the minister said last year, in case of small towns we ought to get public buildings for a great deal less than is being paid. I have in mind a small village where the minister was induced to put up a public building costing well on to $40,000. What I had in view when I obtained an appropriation for it was a building of one story, built in the colonial style, which would be quite attractive and which probably would have cost $5,000 or $6,000 where the post office could be kept; but instead of that a large three-story building has been put up with a residence for the caretaker, involving all the expense of heating the entire building and adding very greatly to the cost. Here we have an instance of a village or town of 1,800 population with a public building costing over $40,000. I think the minister will agree with me that it is desirable to modify the plans and specifications and try and get these buildings at a lower cost.

10 p.m.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend will no doubt recollect that when we were on these Estimates a year ago I made the statement that we were getting out, standard plans providing a building at very moderate cost for a town of 1,500 people, a little better

one for a town of 2,000 or 2,500 people making the cost much less than appears in the Estimates to-day. These plans have now been completed.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the estimated cost for the town of the size mentioned by the hon. gentleman?

Mr. ROGERS: $12,000 to $14,000.

Mr. MARCIL: In my own constituency in 1910 $5,000 was voted for a public building in the shire town that was to cost $15,000 and we were very well satisfied. Unfortunately the item was struck out and we are without our public building. If the people in my constituency knew that buildings were being erected in towns in Ontario at a cost of $$40,000 or $50,000 they would open their eyes.

Pembrooke—drill hall, $26,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What will this cost?

Mr. ROGERS: About $$60,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there a regiment in Pembroke?

Mr. ROGERS: I could not say.

Mr. G. V. WHITE: There is no regiment in Pembroke at the present time but from Pembroke and the surrounding country we have sent from 125 to 150 men to the front.

Mr. MARCIL: They will not be using the drill hall?

Mr. WHITE: When they come back probably they will. The idea is to establish a half company battalion in Pembroke. I have taken the matter up with the minister on several occasions. Pembroke is within 12 miles of Petewawa military camp and it is the most important town in the Ottawa valley. It has a population of 8,000.

Peterborough—new public building, $47,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the cost of this building?

Mr. ROGERS: The contract has not yet been let.

Mr. MARCIL: What amount is it expected to spend?

Mr. ROGERS: Nothing definite is settled.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I suppose the site has been bought?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Port Arthur—drill hall, $20,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has any amount been fixed for this drill hall?

Mr. ROGERS: This finishes it.

Mr. MARCIL: What will the total cost be there?

Mr. ROGERS: About $215,000.

Mr. MARCIL: That is a pretty good price. How many regiments are stationed at Port Arthur?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know. It is a great military centre.

Mr. MARCIL: I thought it was a grain centre.

Mr. ROGERS: A military centre too.

Mr. MARCIL: The Government have spent many millions of dollars at Port Arthur on useful purposes. I hope the money spent in this case is as useful to the people.

Port Arthur—custom house and examining warehouse, $175,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will this finish?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Preston—public building, $25,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why does that item appear in the Estimates so often? We voted it in 1913-14 and 1914-15 and now we are voting it again in 1915-16. Why is the building not proceeded with?

Mr. ROGERS: It is under contract now.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will this finish it?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the total cost?

Mr. ROGERS: $44,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How large a place is Preston?

Mr. ROGERS: 3,383.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is a pretty good town.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Sault Ste. Marie—drill hall, $25,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the cost of this?

Mr. ROGERS: Nothing has been done there yet.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any estimate of the cost of this drill hall ?

Mr. ROGERS: No estimate.

Shelburne—public building, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will this finish the building?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Smith's Falls public building—enlargement and improvements, $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will that complete it?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Steelton—public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will that complete?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Stratford — public building — addition to, $20,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has that been commenced yet?

Mr. ROGERS: Not started yet.

Sudbury—public building, $35,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is to be the cost of this building?

Mr. ROGERS: This finishes it.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the cost of the building?

Mr. ROGERS: $98,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is it to be used for?

Mr. ROGERS: The usual public building—post office, customs and inland revenue.

Mr. MARCIL: Inland revenue purposes in a place like Sudbury would not require more than two or three rooms, as there would only be one or two officers there.

Mr. ROGERS: The customs takes a lot of room.

Mr. MARCIL: And the rest is given up to the post office?

Mr. ROGERS: Sudbury is a very important centre.

Mr. MARCIL: Well, this is a large sum of money.

Mr. ROGERS: It is an important place.

Mr. MARCIL: In one of the most populous districts of Westmount the Dominion Government carries on its business in a ramshackle old building not worth more than $300. This is a good Tory stronghold and yet there is no $100,000 building there.

Mr. ROGERS: The fact of its being a good Tory stronghold would not apply at all.

Toronto—customs examining warehouse, and postal station "A," $500,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is this going to cost?

Mr. ROGERS: It is not started yet.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has the minister no idea what they are going to spend on that building?

Mr. ROGERS: We have nothing very definite on the subject. It is a very large work and the plans are not prepared as yet. They are under consideration, but nothing has been decided in so far as the total cost is concerned.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is very unusual. I have been in this House for a good many years and it is only recently that we have heard a minister make statements like that. Does he want us to embark upon the erection of a building when he has no plans and when he does not know what the ultimate cost is going to be? We are asked to vote $500,000 without knowing what we are going to embark on. Such a proposition cannot be intelligently placed before the committee, and it is something new in my experience in this House. It is only this year that we have been asked to pass vote after vote without the minister being able to tell us what the plans are.

Mr. J. D. REID: The revenue from the Toronto customs office last year was $20,000,000 and from the Montreal office, $25,000,000, so that Toronto is the second largest revenue office in the Dominion. It is absolutely necessary to have a fireproof examining warehouse, and one sufficiently large to accommodate the great business done there, so that the building will be an expensive one.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What will the ultimate cost be?

Mr. REID: I should think it would cost half a million dollars anyway.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the site been bought?

Mr. REID: Yes, we purchased part of the property from the city of Toronto. The work has not been proceeded with for the reason that the railway companies intend erecting a new station, and as they need to take a piece of the property purchased from the city, we could not get plans prepared until it was decided how much of the property would be taken by the railway companies. That question was settled a short time ago, and the department will be in a position to have the plans prepared immediately.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There were $170,000 spent last year.

Mr. REID: That was for the site. The property was purchased from the city at a very reasonble price; a price lower than it would have been sold to an outsider.

Mr. VERVILLE: I would like it to be well understood that the working people throughout this country will derive no benefit from the moneys we are now voting because the minister tells us that in respect to the great majority of these buildings the plans have not yet been prepared, and that in some cases the sites have not been purchased. Therefore, the money we are now voting cannot be expended during the present fiscal year to relieve the distress which exists in the country. I do not want the Minister of Public Works and his friends to try to make the working people believe that they are going to derive benefit from any of these works, to provide the money for which we are being taxed so heavily.

Walkervile public building, $70,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How much will this building cost?

Mr. ROGERS: The contract price is $78,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the population of Walkerville?

Mr. ROGERS: 3,302.

Public buildings, Manitoba—Altamount drill hall, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the site of this place?

Mr. ROGERS: It is not a large place, but it is the centre for several places immediately surrounding, and $10,000 is to be the total cost of the building.

Carberry public building, $27,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I suppose the site has been purchased?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the estimated cost?

Mr. ROGERS: $21,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why is the minister asking for $27,000?

Mr. ROGERS: The $6,000 is for fittings and improvements. The contract for the building is $21,000.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Carman public building, $10,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Carman seems to be getting on a good deal faster than some of the other towns.

Mr. MARCIL: In what constituency is it?

Mr. ROGERS: In Macdonald. It is a large town of 3,000 people.

Elkhorn public building, $19,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is this building under way yet?

Mr. ROGERS: We have tenders in. The estimated cost is $12,000.

Gretna public building, $25,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the population of Gretna?

Mr. ROGERS: About 700. It is a very important town on the international boundary.

Mr. MARCIL: What amount is proposed to be spent at Gretna?

Mr. ROGERS: This will be the total expenditure.

Mr. MARCIL: $25,000 for 700 people?

Mr. J. D. REID: The population has increased very much since the last census. It is a growing place.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the building to be used for?

Mr. ROGERS: Gretna is a very important centre for customs. It is situated where the railway crosses the boundary, and all the baggage is examined there.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the minister satisfied that this money is being properly expended?

Mr. ROGERS: In this case there is no doubt that it is being properly expended.

Minitonas public building, $10,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Is any progress being made on this building?

Mr. ROGERS: It has not been started yet.

Mr. OLIVER: Has a site been purchased?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Morden public building, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There was a vote of $20,000 last year, and the revote is only $3,000, so that $17,000 must have been spent last year on this building. What is the total cost?

Mr. ROGERS: This $3,000 will finish the building.

Portage la Prairie drill hall, $20,000.

Mr. MARCIL: How much will this building cost?

Mr. ROGERS: The plans have not been prepared yet.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister has no idea whether it will cost $50,000 or $75,000 or $100,000?

Mr. ROGERS: We will make it as low as we possibly can.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any regiment at Portage la Prairie?

Mr. ROGERS: It is quite a military centre. I would like my hon. friend to go out West and see some of the towns there.

Mr. MARCIL: I have no objection to the proper use of money for public buildings, but to put up drill halls in towns where there are only two or three companies is a sheer waste of public money.

Mr. ROGERS: I can assure my hon. friend that Portage la Prairie is a very important centre and very deserving from a military point of view.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister ought to know whether there is a regiment there or not.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know.

Rivers public building, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where is Rivers situated, and what is its population?

Mr. ROGERS: It is the divisional point on the Grand Trunk Pacific, immediately north of Brandon. It is a very important place.

St. James drill hall, $25,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the population?

Mr. ROGERS St. James is quite a large section of the western part of Winnipeg. The population is about 4,500.

Mr. MARCIL: It is a suburb of Winnipeg?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Stonewall public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is this building going to cost?

Mr. ROGERS: $31,000.

Virden public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will this $10,000 complete this building?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Winnipeg barracks, $150,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is this a new building?

Mr. ROGERS: The barracks have not been started yet. We had a barracks at Winnipeg that this Government sold to the local Government. These barracks are to take the place of the old ones.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the estimated cost?

Mr. ROGERS: We have not made an estimate yet.

Winnipeg new drill hall, $170,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is this drill hall independent of the barracks?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is its total cost?

Mr. ROGERS: $540,000. This completes it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is this a second drill hall?

Mr. ROGERS: This is a large drill hall. There are two others.

Winnipeg new immigration building, $40,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Where is this new immigration building situated?

Mr. ROGERS: We are buying a lot not very far from the present building which was unsuitable on account of its being too close to the tracks, and which is required for a postal station. It was recommended that the old building should be turned into a postal station as it is very convenient for the mails arriving at the station, and that a more desirable location could be had for an immigration building. The new building will be about one block from the old one. It will be at the corner of Maple and Macdonald streets.

Mr. OLIVER: North of the tracks?

Mr. ROGERS: South of the tracks.

Mr. OLIVER: But further east?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the total estimated cost?

Mr. ROGERS: We have just bought the site; we have not the plans yet. We thought on account of immigration falling off we would delay the construction of the building.

Winnipeg new drill hall, $170,000.

Mr. PARDEE: Three drill halls for Winnipeg?

Mr. ROGERS: We are building a drill hall at St. James, at a suburb of Winnipeg, and we are putting up one in North Winnipeg, which has a very large population composed almost entirely of foreigners, a great number of whom have taken to military drill in a very creditable manner. We are encouraging them by building this drill hall. It is very desirable under the circumstances.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the estimated cost?

Mr. ROGERS: The cost is $103,000. In North Winnipeg we have one squadron of the 34th Regiment, one battery C.F.A., one troop C.E., eight companies of the 78th Battalion, eight companies of the 90th Battalion, eight companies of the 100th Battalion, eight companies of the 106th Battalion, one section of the Signalling Corps, two sections of the A.S.C., one section of the C.A.V.C., and one corps of Guides.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Do these belong to the contingent now formed?

Mr. ROGERS: Some of them do.

Mr. McCRANEY: In how many cities have we more than one drill hall?

Mr. ROGERS: Montreal and Halifax.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is there a drill hall already in Winnipeg?

Mr. ROGERS: No, except the one just completed.

Mr. MARCIL: There is more in building and enlarging drill halls just now than in immigration buildings.

Mr. ROGERS: Drill halls are more occupied at the moment.

Mr. MARCIL: No great immigration is expected this year?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, we are looking for very good immigration this year; the prospects are very good, I understand.

Battleford public building—improvements, $4,500.

Mr. McCRANEY: What is this for?

Mr. ROGERS: This is for an additional 15½ by 42 feet, for the purposes of a land office.

Mr. OLIVER: This is the old Battleford building?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Canora public building, $10,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Has anything been done in Canora?

Mr. ROGERS: Not yet.

Mr. OLIVER: No land bought? No plans prepared?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Kindersley public building, $20,000.

Mr. McCRANEY: Have any plans been made for this building?

Mr. ROGERS: Not yet.

Mr. McCRANEY: Will the minister spend the money this year?

Mr. ROGERS: It is just like the others—I will spend it if I can get to it.

Moosejaw customs examining warehouse, $90,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Is that making progress?

Mr. ROGERS: We have bought the site.

Mr. OLIVER: Are you going on with the building? Will progress be made with the building this year?

Mr. ROGERS: We will have to try it; this building is being pressed very much.

Moosejaw immigration hall, $50,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the progress with that?

Mr. ROGERS: Not making any progress. I think that can afford to stand.

Moosejaw new public building, $15,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Is that the new post office?

Mr. ROGERS: We are putting an addition to the old building. It has been going on for a couple or three years. This finishes the work.

Regina customs examining warehouse, $75,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Is anything being done on that building?

Mr. ROGERS: Just the purchase of the site.

Mr. OLIVER: Will progress be made this year?

Mr. ROGERS: I think we will have to do it, because the department is pressing.

Mr. OLIVER: What will be the total cost of the building?

Mr. ROGERS: A year ago, when the estimate was made, it was about $200,000.

Regina—accommodation for Asst. Receiver General, $75,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is the hon. minister building a separate building for the Assistant Receiver General?

Mr. ROGERS: Every capital city in the Dominion has an Assistant Receiver General's building except Saskatchewan and Alberta, and they are being provided for.

Rosthern public building, $10,000.

Mr. McCRANEY: Has the site been bought?

Mr. ROGERS: Not yet.

Mr. McCRANEY: What is the estimate for this building?

Mr. ROGERS: The population of the town is 1,172. The cost will come within the range of $15,000 or $20,000.

Saskatoon—customs examining warehouse, $50,000.

Mr. McCRANEY: Has the site been bought?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. McCRANEY: What is the estimate for the building?

Mr. ROGERS: About $150,000.

Saskatoon drill hall, $30,000.

Mr. McCRANEY: How about the property used for militia purposes and purchased in 1911? I think the Minister of Militia said it was too small and there were some negotiations in progress to exchange it. Can the Minister of Public Works inform us as to that?

Mr. ROGERS: The negotiations to which my hon. friend refers have taken place in the Militia Department.

Saskatoon new public buillding, $75,000.

Mr. McCRANEY: I understand this new public building is to be erected some distance away from the business centre. It is in a part of the city that very few of us pass as we are going to business. It is two blocks at least from the main street, and the department, I understand, have paid $1,000 a foot for the property. I want to tell the minister that of all the wildcat boom schemes, for some of which we blame the banks, the Government of this country is more blameable in this than in any other that I know of. I am not complaining merely that the minister paid too much; for that would mean that it would be all right if it had been got cheaper. But I think the property would be most unsuitable for a post office site if the minister got it for nothing. I hope that before he spends more money from this appropriation, he will ask his own friends in Saskatoon about this proposed post office. It is to be at a place that will be inconvenient for many years to come. It should never have been selected, and would never have been selected had not half a dozen of the leading members of the Conservative Association bought adjoining property, and they thought this would help them out. I understand that some money has been expended during this winter; dynamite was used and excavation was made in order to provide labour. I do not object to that, because the necessity is great to relieve some of the destitution. But every man who wanted work had to seek the recommendation of the Conservative candidate, and every man who got work had to undertake to become a member of the Conservative Association. I do not know whether that was under the minister's instruction or not. The earth taken out was put on the bank of the river in a dump. There is only one further expenditure I would like to see with regard to that property, and that is to take the dump back from where it is and put it into the hole again, and then let the minister get rid of that property as fast as he can.

Mr. ROGERS: I am surprised at the statement which my hon. friend makes, especially in view of the fact that I myself had the pleasure of visiting Saskatoon, of meeting a large number of people there, and of examining this site, together with others suggested at that time. In my humble judgment, the site selected is one of the very best in the city for the purposes of a post office, and, so far as I have ever heard, is satisfactory to practically the entire population of Saskatoon. In regard to the excavation, we were pressed this year to find employment for many unemployed persons, and we undertook to excavate for the foundation of the proposed building. I am sorry that my hon. friend is opposed to our putting up a public building of this magnitude in an important centre like Saskatoon, but we believe it to be in the public interest, and will, therefore, proceed with the work as rapidly as possible.

Mr. McCRANEY: The hon. minister is not justified in suggesting that I am opposed to the erection of a public building in Saskatoon. I want to see a public building in Saskatoon, but in the place where a building of the kind proposed ought to be.

The site selected may be suitable for the construction of an armoury or something of that nature, but for a building which must be in a convenient position for the public, it is not at all suitable.

Athabaska Landing—new public building, $5,000.

Mr. OLIVER: I notice that the sum of $5,000 for this purpose appeared in the Estimates last year, and that it is being revoted this year. I discussed this Estimate with the minister on two previous occasions, and urged the erection of this building. It is a very modest amount, and I take this opportunity of repeating what I have said on former occasions: that there is very great need for accommodation at Athabaska Landing for the Government business there, postal, telegraphic, and land business. This business is very seriously handicapped by the lack of reasonable and suitable accommodation, and I urge upon the minister once more that this expenditure be made, not for the sake of spending the money at all, but to meet the absolute necessity for accommodation at that place.

Mr. ROGERS: I appreciate what my hon. friend has said, and realize that there is great necessity for a building of this kind at Athabaska Landing. We have just finished the immigration hall there, and, now that that is out of the way, we will endeavour to go on with the other public building.

Bassano public building, $15,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the situation with regard to this building?

Mr. ROGERS: This completes it.

Mr. OLIVER: What will be the total cost?

Mr. ROGERS: $23,400.

Calgary new post office site and building, $110,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has an estimate been made of the cost of this work?

Mr. ROGERS: The cost is estimated at $800,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What will the drill hall cost?

Mr. ROGERS: Probably $300,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the size of Calgary now?

Mr. ROGERS: About 100,000.

[Mr. McCraney.]

Mr. OLIVER: Where is the new post office site?

Mr. ROGERS: It is the same site, with an extension of 90 feet.

Castor public building, $16,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the situation with regard to this building?

Mr. ROGERS: We have the site.

Mr. OLIVER: Will any progress be made this year?

Mr. ROGERS: It is like all the rest; we will try.

Edmonton post office, addition, $100,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the intention with regard to this addition to the Edmonton post office? I imagine that it will involve the purchase of additional land; has that been taken into consideration?

Mr. ROGERS: We have had reports and valuations, one respecting an addition to the rear of the present building, and another respecting an addition to the side, but we have not arrived at any conclusion as to which is the more desirable and the cheaper.

Mr. OLIVER: What frontage on the side was it the intention to add?

Mr. ROGERS: My deputy has not that information, but I shall be glad to get it for my hon. friend. The present property has a frontage of 90 feet and a depth of 150 feet. That, of course, does not include the proposed addition.

Mr. OLIVER: What was the estimated total cost of that addition to the building, exclusive of the land?

Mr. ROGERS: We have not made that up because we are arranging to get the site and until that is secured an estimate cannot be made. We are proposing the addition simply because of the congested conditions in the Edmonton post office.

Mr. OLIVER: I suppose that the addition will conform in architectural design to the building already there.

Mr. ROGERS: Oh yes, that is a very neat building. that is there.

Edmonton customs examining warehouse, $75,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Is anything being done in regard to that?

Mr. ROGERS: We have bought the site, at the corner of Third and Pease avenue.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there any intention of going on this summer?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know, it depends on how hard I am pressed by the Minister of Customs.

Mr. REID: I will press hard, I promised the member for Edmonton.

Edmonton new drill hall, $200,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is expected to be the total cost of this drill hall?

Mr. ROGERS: $350,000.

Mr. OLIVER: And when will it likely be completed?

Mr. ROGERS: This year, this amount completes it.

Grande Prairie immigration hall, $3,000.

Mr. OLIVER: I am requested to ask how it was that this vote was not expended. It will be observed that it was voted last year and no expenditure was made.

Mr. ROGERS: We have prepared plans under this item and have forwarded them to the Interior Department for approval, but they have not been returned yet. I understand there is some question about the location or something of that kind.

Mr. OLIVER: It is not a large amount, but there is a very large movement of people into that country. If it will ever be wanted it is wanted now.

Mr. ROGERS: It is undoubtedly a pressing necessity for the place.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it likely to go forward this summer?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, I think it is almost sure to.

Mr. OLIVER: How many buildings are rented by the Government at Grande Prairie from A. Patterson and John Patterson and what amounts of rent are paid?

Mr. ROGERS: I am unable to give a very accurate answer. I am told by the deputy that we rent the post office, but I do not know any more at the moment. I will be very glad to look up the information.

High River public building, $20,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Is that going forward?

Mr. ROGERS: The plans are prepared, but we have not started the work yet.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the site purchased?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Macleod public building, $25,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the position there?

Mr. ROGERS: There is difficulty about the site; the site is not settled.

Vegreville public building, $25,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the position there?

Mr. ROGERS: We have the site.

Mr. OLIVER: Will anything be done this summer?

Mr. ROGERS: We will try. The plans are partly prepared.

Vermilion public building, $20,000.

Mr. OLIVER: I would ask the same questions.

Mr. ROGERS We have the site and the plans, but nothing further has been done. I would not to like to say whether it will go forward this summer.

Wainwright public building, $20,000.

Mr. OLIVER: I would make the same inquiry.

Mr. ROGERS: We have the plans, we have the site and are ready to call for tenders in that case. It will likely go forward this summer.

Kamloops drill hall, $29,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the situation there?

Mr. ROGERS: This is required for the erection of a drill hall situated
11 p.m. at the corner of Columbia street and Sixth avenue, 100 feet by 250 feet.

Victoria new drill hall, $150,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What will this cost?

Mr. ROGERS: About $300,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is that a second drill hall in Victoria?

Mr. ROGERS: No, this is the first one.

Victoria observatory, $75,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What will be the total cost of the observatory and the land?

Mr. ROGERS: The total cost will be $75,000.

Mr. OLIVER: There is a vote of $75,000 for the present year and there was a vote of $15,000 for the past year.

Mr. ROGERS: It was started with a vote of $15,000.

Mr. OLIVER: $75,000 and $15,000 make $90,000.

Mr. ROGERS: That must be an error. My deputy says that the $15,000 was for the meteorological part of it, another building altogether.

Mr. OLIVER: I have been trying to track down the cost of this observatory and the telescope.

Mr. ROGERS: $55,000 will be spent on the dome and building.

Mr. OLIVER: I understood from the Minister of the Interior—of course I was mistaken—that the total cost would be $90,000 for the telescope and building. I find from the Minister of Public Works that the cost is somewhere between $75,000 and $90,000 which does not include any part of the instruments or the fittings, I suppose?

Mr. ROGERS: Just the dome. It includes $12,000 for the residence that we are not building this year.

Mr. OLIVER: So that we are investing $90,000 under the Public Works Estimates and whatever we invested under the Interior Department Estimates for the instrument is additional?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before passing from the British Columbia items, would the minister state what is to be the cost of the detention building at Vancouver?

Mr. ROGERS: The total cost is $343,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why is a new building necessary? There was a detention building erected at Vancouver not very long ago and I remember a good deal of criticism from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House as to the needless expense of that building. Apparently that building is being abandoned and a new one is being erected at a cost three or four times as much as that one cost.

Mr. ROGERS: I confess that when I was there a year ago I was very much surprised at this old building. I regarded it as a very poor building and I thought it was not in keeping with the importance of a city such as Vancouver.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is not a large immigration at Vancouver from the sea. It was argued that no very great accommodation was required for the purpose of detaining immigrants at that city.

Mr. ROGERS: Things have changed very much in the last three or four years.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: What department has pressed for this new building?

Mr. ROGERS: The immigration department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the minister any report?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not have it here.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps the minister would kindly produce that because I remember distinctly that my department was quite severely criticised by reason of the erection of what was alleged to be too expensive a building although the minister says that it is a very cheap building compared with the magnificent building he is now erecting.

Mr. STEVENS: I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken, because the building now occupied as an immigration shed is a part of the Canadian Pacific freight shed, belongs to the Canadian Pacific Railway and is used by the Government under sufferance simply as a convenience. It is convenient to the landing place of the ships. The hon. gentleman apparently refers to the criticism of some other building.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I might have had another building in mind, but I feel quite sure that it was the detention building. It was not a very expensive one.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sure the hon. gentleman would not be criticised for the building I saw there.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Some of the members from British Columbia on the other side of the House criticised the expenditure.

Mr. STEVENS: Possibly it was at Victoria, not at Vancouver. The Government never owned an immigration building in Vancouver.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) may be right; it may have been at Victoria.

Mr. OLIVER: While the figures for public buildings of the four western provinces are quite imposing, when the re-votes are deducted they are not quite so imposing. I would call the attention of the minister to these figures:

Public buildings.	Vote.	Revote.
Manitoba..	$1,850,000	$752,500
Saskatchewan ...	806,500	711,500
Alberta	921,000	638,000
British Columbia.	1,546,500	995,500

While the figures are quite imposing, the actual expenditure is not nearly so im-

posing; in fact, it is only about 25 per cent of the total vote.

Mr. ROGERS: I would like to draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that the Estimates of which these are revotes were only passed by this House in June of last year, and the Department of Public Works did not have a very great opportunity of carrying out these works before the first of August. From that time on, as my hon. friend is well aware, we have not been pressing, as we previously did, the construction of public buildings generally. The same thing applies to all the other provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister might also call our attention to the fact that instead of bringing his Estimates on earlier so that they could be passed and, if it suited the convenience of His Royal Highness assent-to, he could get on with the work, the minister, with his usual adroitness, waits until we are wearied out at the last of the session—

Mr. ROGERS: I never credited my hon. friend with being wearied.

Mr. PUGSLEY: —when we have not the courage nor the energy to examine into these Estimates. There is a good deal o cleverness shown in that; but after all the minister should bring down his estimates early in the session and get to work expeditiously on them.

Mr. J. D. REID: If I remember aright, when my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) was minister he always brought down his Estimates at the end of the session.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No. Does not the Minister of Customs remember how he used to fight me from the beginning to end of the session, day after day, and night after night.

Mr. ROGERS: We will take advantage of an early session next year to bring down the Estimates.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The total amount asked for public works in 1912-13 was $7,601,800, and the total number asked for this year is $14,891,300, so that the increase in the past few years is alarming. The erection of public buildings is not a productive expenditure, and with a decreasing revenue it shows gross extravagance to ask close on fifteen million dollars, in a year like this when the Government finds it necessary to increase the postage, and to tax patent medicines, and to levy unusual taxes on the people. I venture to say that the erection of buildings represented by three-fourths of this fifteen million dollars could be delayed, without any loss to the country. It is a nice thing to have public buildings when you can afford it, and the total amount asked for this year is to have them, but I do not think we can afford these public buildings just now. The minister will find it difficult to defend his policy.

Mr. ROGERS: The principal expenditure has been on the harbours and rivers.

Experimental Farms—new buildings and improvements; tobacco-curing station, renewals and repairs, etc., in connection with existing buildings, fences, etc., $150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How much of this is to be expended on the so-called experimental farm near Fredericton?

Mr. ROGERS: $5,858.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I say "so-called" because I am told the farm is utterly unadapted for the purposes for which it was purchased.

Mr. ROGERS: You will have to take that up with the Minister of Agriculture.

Ottawa public buildings—repairs, including ventilation and lighting, furniture, etc., $415,000.

Mr. PROULX: I hope that no more furniture will be bought for the ministers' offices, because, judging by the Auditor General's Report, enough was bought last year. I referred to this question last Saturday night.

Mr. ROGERS: You only spoke of two last Saturday night.

Mr. PROULX: I referred particularly to two, but there was new furniture for all the ministers' offices, and I hope there will not be any more purchased.

Mr. J. D. REID: There was none purchased for my office.

Mr. PROULX: You have very good furniture there already.

Dominion public buildings—rents, $675,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How much is being paid by the Government for rental in the city of Ottawa?

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be glad to get that information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It has been stated by the minister, in reply to a question, that $44,000 per annum is paid by the Govern-

ment for the rental of a portion of the Rea building. Is that entirely for the accommodation of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Naval Service?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: So that the very large sum of $44,000 per annum is paid as rental for the accommodation simply of one department.

Mr. ROGERS: There are really two departments.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There are two departments, but under the one minister. That $44,000 per year amounts to 4·4 per cent on a capitalization of $1,000,000, and does not the minister think it is an enormous rental to pay?

Mr. ROGERS: The space rented in the Rea building for the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Naval Service is rented at the lowest price we have paid in the city of Ottawa for years.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In considering whether rent is low or not, one must have regard to the part of a building which is occupied. I understand these are three flats which are above the store of the A. E. Rea Company, Limited, so that whether the rent is cheaper than the rent paid in other places depends somewhat upon the relative value of the upper stories as compared with the lower stories of the building.

Mr. ROGERS: My deputy minister informs me that all the space is used on the three flats.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When I was minister, there seemed to be plenty of accommodation for the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Naval Service in the western block. I realized, of course, that some additional accommodation may be needed in the near future; but we were all looking forward to the erection of new public buildings. I was astonished that it was found necessary to go outside and pay such large rents in order to give that accommodation which only three years ago was found in the western block for the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of the Naval Service. I do not understand why the demand should grow so suddenly that it is found necessary to go to this large additional expenditure.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend appears to have overlooked the fact that, while the Marine and Fisheries Department was in the western block, it had four or five other offices in other parts of the city of Ottawa, in the Corry building on Sussex street, the Birks building and the Canadian building, all of which have been vacated by that department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the Canadian building been vacated?

Mr. ROGERS: The tidal service is still there.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Canadian building is still being occupied by the Government and the rent is still being paid by the Government?

Mr. ROGERS: We assembled the whole department under the one roof.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What department is occupying the buildings vacated by the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. ROGERS: The Customs Department in the western block; the Printing Bureau took the Sussex street block, and the Department of the Interior took the Canadian building. The Corry building has been given up.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then, with the exception of the Corry building, all the other buildings rented three years ago are still occupied by departments of the Government?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Take the Customs Department. There seemed to be plenty of room in the western block for that department. I never heard there was any overcrowding, and there has not been any large increase in the number of clerks to cause them to want one more room. I really find it difficult to believe that it has become necessary to rent all these additional buildings during the last three years.

Mr. J. D. REID: Some of the branches of the Customs Department were in outside buildings. I think the cheque branch and part of the statistics branch were moved into the western block when the Department of Marine and Fisheries vacated it. It is more convenient to have the cheque branch and the statistics branch, in fact that Department of Customs generally altogether. The statistics branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce also took part of the offices vacated by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the western block.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand it is more convenient to have larger accommodation so

that the clerks can move around without being too near each other, but the expenditure to which the Public Works Department has gone during the last three years is simply appalling.

Mr. ROGERS: You mean with regard to rent; you do not mean our department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I mean the general expenditure. One expenditure is in harmony with another. It is a case of increasing expenditure all around. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has drawn attention to it. I would like the Minister of Customs to take for a moment the figures of the last three years. It was he who told the people of St. John that if they wanted larger accommodation the expenditure of more millions of dollars, all they had to do was to come to the Customs Department and get all the money they wanted. It is such extravagance as that, which he has been holding out to his colleague the Minister of Public Works, that has led him astray and kept him from keeping a tight rein on expenditure. In the three years ended the 31st of March, 1912, the total expenditure on account of both capital and income, of the Department of Public Works, amounted to $36,000,000, whereas in the three years ended the 31st of March, 1915, taking the Estimates of last year as the basis of expenditure, the total expenditure amounted to $86,000,000, a difference very close to $50,000,000.

Mr. BURNHAM: How many millions would a fleet have cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY: If we had had a fleet to-day of light cruisers and destroyers, no doubt they would have been able ten times over to have paid what they would have cost, in capturing ships of the enemy while this war was on, and those vessels sailing upon the Atlantic.

Mr. BURNHAM: They would have been a floating liability.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not the Minister of Customs think those figures are calculated to startle the public of this country? Yet, with all this enormous expenditure the Minister of Customs rejoices that he has been able to get more accommodation. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) is not here to-night; but it certainly seems astonishing that to give accommodation to one department alone the enormous rent of $44,000 is being paid for three upper stories of a building, the lower stories of which are occupied as a departmental store. Those upper stories, of course, would not be necessary for the business of a departmental store, and it must be very profitable to the owners of this building to have them rented. I should think $1,000,000 or $1,100,000 would be a very good price for the whole building. As a matter of fact, three or four years ago $900,000 was regarded as a good price for that building, and I believe the owners of the building said that they would be willing to sell it to the Government at that price.

Mr. J. D. REID: That was before they put the other three stories on top.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There were not three new stories.

Mr. REID: Two or three.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think only one.

Mr. REID: The deputy minister informs me that two new stories were built.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Two extra stories on a building of that size would not cost a very large amount of money. I venture to say that they would not cost over $50,000 or $100,000.

Mr. EDWARDS: Did the A. E. Rea Company, Limited, not build an addition to the building as well as build the two new stories?

Mr. PUGSLEY: If they did, that would be for the benefit of the business as well.

Mr. REID: They have built the north end from the ground up.

Mr. EDWARDS: That would materially affect your calculations.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It would to that extent; but you can put up a very good addition to a building at from $50,000 to $100,000. It does strike me as a very large rental.

Mr. MARCIL: Do officials of the Canadian Navy occupy this building?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: How many officers employed in the Canadian Navy are in this building?

Mr. ROGERS: The hon. member will have to get that information from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Minister of Customs (Mr. J. D. Reid), I notice, is in his place. About three weeks ago he promised to bring down information about the rental of a building for his department in North Syd-

ney. I called attention to the fact that he had refused to do business directly with the owner of the building who would have rented it for $15 a month, and thought it necessary to bring in a middleman and give him twice the money. The minister said he could not believe that such a transaction had taken place. But I put a question on the Order Paper since, and the answer confirms what I said. The middleman's name is given and double the amount of the rent at which the owner would have rented the building. Perhaps the minister has looked into my statement and found it to be correct.

Mr. J. D. REID: The rental of the building in North Sydney was arranged by officials of the department. I inquired of them, and they tell me that the rental is fair. If I remember rightly, part of he building is occupied by the person from whom we have rented it, and we have only part of it.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is what I said.

Mr. REID: We could not deal with the owner if another person had the whole building under rental. I do not know about the matter, but I have confidence in the officials that they would secure the place at a reasonable rental. If there is any further information in the department I will bring it down.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is a small matter but the minister is not going to slide out of it a second time. There is no question about the facts. The owner of the building told me personally that he would have been glad to rent the building to the Customs Department at $15 a month and tried to do so, but they would not do business with him—that is the straight talk. But a stranger who had nothing to do with the building came and said: I will rent the building from you for three years. The owner rented it to him at $15 a month, and he immediately turned it over to the department at $30 a month. Pure graft on a small scale.

Mr. REID: It is a strange thing, if he wanted to rent the building to the Department of Customs, that he would not write to the department or to myself as minister. It is all very well for a man to make a statement after the building is rented; he can make any kind of a statement then, when it is too late. The Commissioner of Customs tells me that the building was rented at a fair and reasonable rate.

Mr. McKENZIE: The party who rented it from the owner had no use for the building except to rent it again. The owner tried

to do business with the department before the third man came in, but they would not do business with him, but did rent it from the other party at double the price.

Mr. REID: To what officer did he want to rent it?

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand it was Mr. Cameron, the appraiser, who wanted a room.

Mr. REID: The appraiser would have nothing to do with renting a building. The collector is the one to be seen in such a matter. Why did not he go to the collector, who is an appointee of the hon. member himself.

Mr. McKENZIE: It does not make any difference; there are the facts. There is no mistake about it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman says he has the facts. Will he let us know who is the officer of the Government who could have rented this place at $15? If the hon. gentleman will let us know, we will make inquiries.

Mr. McKENZIE: The building is owned by Mr. Charles Millar, who told me himself what I have stated. I did not solicit the information, and know nothing about it of my own knowledge. He told me that he wanted to rent the building to the Government, but they would not do business with him.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is very important to know what officer of the Government undertook to do that; and now that my hon. friend has gone so far with it, I think it is his duty to let us know what officer of the Government declined to take this place at $15 a month, and afterwards rented it from another party at $30 a month.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: The same thing happened in Montreal, in the case of a building in Maisonneuve occupied as a post office. It is No. 116 Letourneau street. The building is owned by a Madame De Bellefeuille, who is a tenant of my own. The building was rented by a man at $15 a month, and he received from the Government $30 a month. She heard about it and put in a claim for the rental that the other party had been receiving . I have the name of the man in my office, and I will give it to you.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Who is the officer?

Mr. MARTIN: I have not the name of the man here, but I have it at home.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman will give us the names of officers conducting business in that way, we will attend to it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know whether the Prime Minister thinks it my business to inquire for the department into the rental of buildings. But that is a matter entirely within the department itself. They can find out who made the bargain; and I have not the means of doing so.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The only reason I made the inquiry was that the hon. gentleman said that he was seized of the facts. He made the statement, as I understood him, that some officer of the Government had declined to do business in respect of this building at $15 a month and had afterwards done business at $30 a month under different conditions. If that is true, very strict inquiry should be made into it. I asked the name of the officer because I understood the hon. gentleman knew it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not. I am perfectly honest in the matter. I would give the name of the party who negotiated the business, but I do not know it. I am relying on the statement made to me by the owner of the building; and I am supported by the statement which the minister himself brought down showing that the Government is paying $30 a month for the building, while the owner says he is receiving $15.

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—Advocate, widening and repairing wharf, $2,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Some hon. gentlemen who are not present this evening may wish to ask some questions with regard to these items.

Mr. ROGERS: Any hon. gentleman on the other side may ask any question he likes while these Estimates are under consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It may be well to have it understood that under items affecting New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, we may ask as to Nova Scotia, and vice versa.

Mr. ROGERS: Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As to the dredging plant at Fort Lawrence in Nova Scotia; I should like the minister to let me know later, if he has not the information before him, what that plant is and what it cost the Government.

Cape Dauphin—boat harbour, $1,500.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is a sort of breakwater, I understand, to afford shelter to boats. Has anything been done in connection with it, or is it the intention of the minister to go on with it during the coming summer?

Mr. ROGERS: Nothing has been done so far. The estimated cost of the whole work is about $8,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was rather surprised to find that such a small amount had been put in for this work.

Mr. ROGERS: It is a revote from last year.

Cole harbour—wharf, $8,300.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This work was first projected by the late Government in 1911, and it has appeared in the Estimates each year ever since. I should like to know what the minister intends to do with regard to it. Does he intend to go ahead with the work, or is it put in the Estimates to tantalize the people? This is the only item of expenditure in my constituency, which has a seacoast of 150 miles. A good many small improvements, along the coast, were asked for by the fishermen, and were all refused by the minister. Some of the most important items were struck out of the Estimates as provided in 1911, including an extension to the New Harbour breakwater, which was a very important local work. New Harbour is an exposed harbour on the Atlantic coast. It was with great difficulty that the fishing population in that vicinity carried on their business at all, and when the breakwater was built about ten years ago it was so useful that a village grew up there and the place became a flourishing fishing station. The boats became so numerous that the shelter constructed at that time was not sufficient, and the late Government, acting upon the advice of the chief engineer, decided to extend the breakwater so as to give shelter to the increasing number of boats operating in that vicinity. The present minister, for some reason which I do not understand, took this $10,000 out of the Estimates, and it has not been put in since. This is an important matter to the people of that vicinity.

Mr. ROGERS: I am not acquainted with all the details of the matters to which my hon. friend has referred, but so far as this vote is concerned, it is the intention of the department to go on with the work as soon

as possible. There has been some difficulty in the way of securing a proper title, by reason of the fact that it has to be obtained from certain heirs of an estate. It is largely owing to this condition that the delay has occurred.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is a small expenditure; what is that for?

Mr. ROGERS: For a survey.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Have any proceedings been taken to settle the title?

Mr. ROGERS: We have been hoping from time to time to succeed in getting it, and if we do not get it in the near future, we propose to expropriate.

Cribbin's point—new wharf and removal of old pier, $17,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. ROGERS: It is a revote of $17,000, required for the purpose of strengthening the wharf with native and creosote timber and brickwork, removing the old pier and building a new retaining wall. Estimated cost, $17,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How often has that been revoted?

Mr. ROGERS: I could not say; I have only the record here that it was revoted last year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will it be built this year?

Mr. ROGERS: I really would not like to assure my hon. friend that it will be. We will try if we possibly can get to it. It seems to be a pressing work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is no difficulty about the site there?

Mr. ROGERS: There is nothing in the memorandum about any difficulty.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why is my hon. friend doubtful about getting to it?

Mr. ROGERS: It will depend on our being able to get to it. My hon. friend is anxious that we should cut down the expenditure and we are anxious to please him as far as we can.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am not anxious to cut down this expenditure.

East River—improvements, $100,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is in Pictou?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, that is under contract and this is to complete it.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. SINCLAIR: You hope to get it finished this year?

Mr. ROGERS: They are at work there now.

French River—extension of breakwater pier, $2,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Which French river is that?

Mr. ROGERS: This is in Victoria county.

Mr. McKENZIE: The wharf at French river is new. Is it the intention of the minister to extend it and make it longer?

Mr. ROGERS: This is towards the construction of an extension of 100 feet, and the cost is placed at $4,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: The first section of the breakwater or wharf is only a year or so old. Can the minister tell what depth of water they will have at the outer end of the extension?

Mr. ROGERS: This is to increase the depth from four to nine feet at low water.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am sorry that it is not being extended a little farther. It will be of no service to increase it to that depth, except as a shelter. The only boat which can give a service there has a draft of 12 feet. If it could be extended out to a depth of 12 feet it would be very much more serviceable.

Mr. ROGERS: We will try to extend that further another year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is not an isolated case. The minister built a wharf in my constituency for a boat to call at, but the depth of water is not enough for the boat to call.

Mr. ROGERS: We will have to try and correct that.

Inverness—harbour improvements, $15,000.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: What was done here last year?

Mr. ROGERS: Nothing was done here last year.

Mr. CHISHOLM: There was some expenditure last year. It may have been taken out of the general vote.

Mr. ROGERS: That may be. This is simply a revote of $15,000 voted last year.

Mr. CHISHOLM: How much was expended there the year before last?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not that information here, but I can get it from the department.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The minister has no knowledge of the work done there a few years ago and how it has stood the storms and whether it is in a satisfactory condition now. I would suggest that he ascertain these facts and also how the money has been expended. There was considerable money expended on the work, and very substantial work was done up to two years ago. Since then my information is that the work has been rather slipshod, and I would suggest that the minister look into it and see just what is being done. Is it the intention to spend this money this year?

12 m.

Mr. ROGERS: We will have it looked into and if it is very pressing we will be glad to give it as favourable consideration as possible, along with other public works.

Mr. CHISHOLM: It is very pressing, I can assure the minister. This is a work which was commenced four or five years ago and which is very important.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. Tuesday.

Tuesday, April 6, 1915.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. D. C. ROSS (West Middlesex): I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question in reference to the compensation to be paid in respect of animals infected with foot and mouth disease which may be destroyed. As the Prime Minister has told us, the old Compensation Act was passed nine or ten years ago, and the rate of compensation stipulated for in that Act is not commensurate with the price of cattle at the present time. If this disease should spread in Ontario the graziers and farmers will consequently not receive proper compensation for slaughtered animals. In my opinion the Government should this session amend the Act, so that those whose cattle are destroyed in the public interest may be adequately recompensed.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): I would prefer if my hon. friend would raise the question when my Estimates come up, but in the meantime I may say that there is no Act dealing with the foot and mouth disease.

Mr. ROSS: I understand that.

Mr. BURRELL: If the disease should spread in this country, and I do not think it likely, speaking off-hand, I do not think the Act would govern; I think we should have to deal with it in a different manner. I will get the information later and let my hon. friend know.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), the House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 74, to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. DOHERTY: I hardly think that the Bill is improved by the amendments made by the Senate, but nevertheless I am prepared to accept them. Section 1 as it left the House made it an indictable offence to incite or assist any subject of any foreign state or country at war with His Majesty to leave Canada, and section 1 contained these words:

> If the circumstances of the case do not exclude the possibility that assistance to the enemy is an intended object in his so leaving Canada, and if such inciting or assisting do not amount to treason.

The Senate struck out these words and inserted in lieu thereof:

> Without the consent of the Crown, unless the person accused shall prove that assistance to the enemy was not intended, and providing, that such inciting or assisting does not amount to treason.

The difference is not very material. Another amendment consists simply in modifying the provisions constituting infringement of copyright a criminal offence, by making it applicable only in express terms to copyrights which subsist in Canada. I think in any event without these words our law could only apply to Canada. I move that the amendments be concurred in.

Amendments concurred in.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), Bill No. 121, to amend the Supreme Court Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1—appeal in election cases, where appeal is given by local legislature:

Mr. DOHERTY: This Bill is introduced in view of the fact that the province of Manitoba, by its Controverted Elections Act of 1913, has provided that there shall be an appeal in controverted election cases to the Supreme Court of Canada. The Provincial Legislature, of course, has no

power to confer jurisdiction on the Supreme Court of Canada, which is a Dominion court; but, inasmuch as by its legislation the legislature of that province has in effect declared that it is desirable that there should be an appeal, and so far as is in its power has created that appeal, it would seem that this Parliament, which alone has power to confer jurisdiction on the Supreme Court to hear and determine such an appeal, should give that jurisdiction. This legislation creates no appeal of itself; it merely confers upon the Supreme Court of Canada jurisdiction to hear and determine such appeals, wherever a Provincial Legislature determines that such an appeal is desirable and ought to be had.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have no intention of opposing this legislation; but in my opinion it is rather dangerous. It was only yesterday that we had a long discussion upon the difficulty of getting a final decision in controverted election cases, and we are this session in this Parliament passing new legislation to expedite as much as possible the hearing and determining of such cases under the Dominion Controverted Elections Act. If I have a fault to find with our judicial system, it is that in the province to which my hon. friend and I belong there is an appeal in such cases to the Supreme Court of Canada. In Manitoba there is an appeal from the trial judge to the Court of King's Bench sitting as a court of review, and another appeal from that court to the Court of Appeal. Under this legislation there would be still another appeal; so that I think we are not conferring a favour upon the province of Manitoba by passing this legislation. I understand that it is the wish of the legislature of Manitoba; but, even so, I would not be disposed to mix up federal matters with provincial matters. If I had an amendment to move to this legislation, I would move that provincial laws should be administered by provincial courts, and federal laws by federal courts. My hon. friend has, however, thought differently, and I merely wish to call his attention to the point I have mentioned, which I believe he will find worthy of consideration.

Mr. DOHERTY: In so far as the desirability of creating such an appeal is concerned, I share in very large measure, if not entirely, the views which the right hon. gentleman has just expressed. If it were a matter of considering the legislation of the legislature of the province of Manitoba in this regard, I would probably concur in the view that he has expressed, and I think there is also very much to be said for the view that we should have these matters speedily settled. The reason which leads me to propose this legislation is that it seems to me that questions concerning the composition of the legislature of a province are in a peculiar manner questions which that legislature itself should determine, and it is therefore a fair thing that, when the legislature of a province has itself determined that it is desirable that upon questions concerning controverted elections there should be an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, we should make it possible for that to be carried out. In fact, the motive that leads me to move this legislation is the recognition which I think ought to be given to the absolute right of the legislature of a province itseslf to determine the best process or means by which elections to that legislature should be determined.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Have any of the provinces asked for this legislation?

Mr. DOHERTY: The province of Manitoba has legislated providing for such an appeal, and has, following upon that, asked that we make it possible for such an appeal to be entertained. As I said at the outset, this legislation does not give an appeal; it merely provides that, where the legislature of a province sees proper to create such a right of appeal, then the Supreme Court of Canada shall have jurisdiction to hear that appeal.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I concur entirely in the observations of the right hon. gentleman opposite in regard to this matter. I do not believe in an appeal from the supreme court of a province to the Supreme Court of Canada regarding controverted elections in that province, and I never have done so. From a logical standpoint, such an appeal should not be entertained, because the legislature itself should determine who should sit in the legislature. It has delegated that power to the supreme court of the province, and I believe no power beyond the territorial limits of that province should in reason have a right to determine or consider who shall sit in its legislature. In the province of Alberta, where we have legislation by which an election petition is regarded as a suit in a court, an attempt was made two years ago to bring an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada; but that court rejected

it, saying it was outside of its jurisdiction. This will enable provincial appeals to be entertained, with the resultant delay in having an appeal heard so many miles away from the place where the case arose; but other provinces have this right and provide for it in their Controverted Election Acts, so that if we desire to have the law uniform I suppose we must pass this legislation, but I am very strongly opposed to the principle of it.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. member thinks that this legislation would give the right to appeal a case such as is referred to from the province of Alberta, I venture to think his idea is unfounded, because we have carefully provided that the jurisdiction to hear and determine shall exist only where the legislature has given an appeal from the provincial courts in a proceeding under any provincial Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. BENNETT: I know.

Mr. DOHERTY: Unless the Legislature of Alberta has expressly provided that there should be an appeal in election cases, this legislation will not give an appeal.

Mr. BENNETT: But in the province they say an election case shall be treated as a case in the Supreme Court, and so, inferentially, this legislation may be construed to authorize an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We are simply giving effect to the desire of the Legislature of Manitoba, which is a very respectable reason. I do not know the circumstances which have led the Legislature of Manitoba to enact this legislation, but I should be very much surprised if that reason were not that they were dissatisfied with some decision of the court. That is always the case; a certain law is passed to affect a certain case, and we violate the principle which should be inviolate—that provincial laws shall be interpreted by provincial courts and federal laws by federal courts. This section reads:

> The Supreme Court of Canada shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any appeal from the judgment of any provincial court in any proceeding under any provincial controverted election Act, whereby such an appeal is given.

Are these words sufficient to restrict the appeal to those cases in which appeal is allowed under provincial legislation?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think so. That was the intention in adopting that wording. I may say that the wording of the original draft did not make reference to a Controverted Elections Act in express terms. For the purpose of making it quite clear that we were merely conferring power to hear and determine where the Controverted Election Act of the province allows an appeal, I adopted this wording. If there is any wording that will make it clearer I shall be glad to adopt it.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

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

Civil Government—Department of Agriculture—salaries, $439,637.50.

Mr. PARDEE: There is an increase here of $26,000; how does that arise?

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): There are no special increases in our Civil Service vote—only the statutory increases and the few additions that naturally come with the increase of the work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Last year the hon. minister had 319 employees in his department, and this year he is making provision for 335, an increase of 16.

Mr. BURRELL: A good many increases are necessitated by the fact that, whereas we have been in the habit of engaging a great many temporary employees, which is often very unsatisfactory, we are arranging to put on the permanent list those that we know we shall require permanently. Most of the classes are exactly the same as last year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There may be a good reason for the increase; but the hon. minister rather boasted that there were no increases in his department, and this takes away from his claim. This vote for salaries is increased from $413,637.50 last year to $439,637.50 this year, an increase of $26,000.

Mr. BURRELL: There are no increases, the right hon. gentleman will see, down to the second division, subdivision B. In that subdivision we have an increase of 12. The first of these appointments is that of Mr. Fixter, who is connected with the Central Experimental Farm. He has been hitherto in the outside service. As nearly all the employees of the Central Experi-

mental Farm are in the permanent inside service, it was thought desirable that Mr. Fixter also should be transferred to the inside service.

Provision has been made for a stenographer for the poultry branch, French and English stenographers for the translation office, another clerk for the meat and canned foods office, a clerk for the dairying branch, and another patent examiner. Provision is made also for five vacancies. As my right hon. friend knows, the work of the Agricultural Department cannot expand as it has been expanding without a natural increase in the clerical staff. We have kept it down as much as possible consistent with the expansion of the work of the department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We will vote the money without further discussion if you will promise to provide us with a better crop this year than we had last year.

Arts and Agriculture—Experimental farms—maintenance of central farm and establishing and maintaining of additional branch stations, $785,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has my hon. friend made provision for an experimental farm in the clay belt district of the Transcontinental railway?

Mr. BURRELL: We have not done that, except in this way: Under the provisions of the war vote last year it was thought desirable to employ the interned Austrian and German prisoners in clearing the land in some portion of northern Ontario and northern Quebec, so that the land could ultimately be used for the demonstration of the possibilities of agriculture in those districts. An arrangement was accordingly made with the governments of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario to give so much land for this purpose, and I think 1,000 acres in the clay belt were given by each province. I have not the exact particulars of the work up to date, but I know that some of the land has been cleared, and the timber which has been cut is to be used for the erection of the necessary buildings. So far as our department goes, we are trying to direct that work so as to make it most useful for demonstration purposes in order to induce settlement in these northern districts.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: So far as it goes, the work may be useful, but I suggest to my hon. friend that it would be advisable to establish an experimental farm in this northern district as soon as possible.

[Mr. Burrell.]

Climate has a great deal to do with the nature of soil; I understand that the soil is extremely fertile in that district. I have seen vegetables which were grown in that country and which were not surpassed by anything I have seen anywhere. The crop last year was not favourable, for some reason. There is no question about the fact that it would be advisable to have an experimental farm there in order to demonstrate the best method of cultivating that particular soil.

Mr. BURRELL: I can assure my hon. friend that that is my desire; our efforts along that line are in that direction.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How many prisoners are there in the detention camps there?

Mr. BURRELL: I cannot give my right hon. friend the exact number; I think there are some hundreds in each. That does not come under this department, except in so far as we are making suggestions as to the direction of the work in order to make it useful from the agricultural standpoint.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that in some of the experimental farms the poultry which the government has is of a very poor class. I do not think that any farmer would have on his farm the kind of poultry which they have on the experimental farm at Charlottetown. They have the Leghorn hens there, which lay a very small egg—it is not even a first-class Leghorn. I do not believe in experimenting with poultry; it takes too long to bring results. The Government can get in Canada to-day better poultry than can be obtained elsewhere in the world, but they do not see fit to obtain such poultry and to put them on the experimental farms. Private persons in Canada have a much better class of poultry than they have at the experimental farms. In the experimental farms they have not the Barred Plymouth Rocks or the Rhode Island Reds, the very best breeds which can be found in Canada. The birds which the experimental farms are raising are poor birds. They lay eggs during the winter months, better, perhaps, than the birds which I have mentioned, but they are not utility birds, and they should not be put before the people of Canada as an example or how to get the best results from poultry. I think the minister should investigate this matter. The men who are in charge of these farms have been educated at the universities; they may

be very good men from the theoretical standpoint, but they do not know as much about the practical part of the work as the men who have obtained their information from practical experience. In many cases they refuse to take the advice of men who have been in this business and who know it from the ground up. They dictate to the practical man; they tell him what he should do—and they put upon the experimental farms a class of poultry which no farmer would have on his farm and which is absolutely useless for utility purposes.

Mr. BURRELL: I appreciate what my hon. friend said, and if there is anything in his criticism which is based on fact, I need hardly assure him that I shall have it looked into and remedied. I do not need to assure the committee or my hon. friend that the desire of myself and of the department is to put this work in such shape as to make it of most benefit, from a practical standpoint, to the farmers of the country. Our poultry work during the last two or three years has enormously expanded, to the general satisfaction, I think, of the practical poultrymen of the country. As to the officers whom we have employed in connection with the Central Experimental Farm, I think I ought to reply to my hon. friend by pointing out that in Mr. Elford, the chief of the poultry division, the poultrymen of Canada have one of the best-posted men in the whole country. Mr. Fortier, who has been there a good many years, is a thoroughly practical man, as is Mr. Robertson, who is thoroughly well acquainted with all phases of poultry work in Canada. If there is anything that these officers are not doing that they should do to promote the special interest of the poultrymen, I can only assure my hon. friend that I shall be glad to take it up and see that the grievance is remedied.

Mr. KNOWLES: There is one point in connection with experimental farms which I wish to impress upon the minister. The largest development of immigration that there has been in western Canada has been into southwestern Saskatchewan. I do not say that the immigration there has been larger than all the rest put together, but the greatest manifestation of immigration has been in the country south of Moosejaw, Gull Lake, Maple Creek, etc. The reason that that country has been the geographical scene of that activity is that for so many years it was considered to be a dry belt, and was for that reason disregarded and rejected by the homesteaders. I think that a district that has been the centre of immigration activity should receive a great deal of the minister's attention at the same time. The very fact that the land in this so-called dry belt was left to the very last must be evidence that it is a different kind of land from the larger part of Saskatchewan and, of course, those of us who know the West know that that is true. It requires a different kind of farming. If the experimental farms are for anything it is to teach the people a kind of farming that is not the ordinary farming in the province or in the whole country. In that whole district, into which have gone tens of thousands of people, there has not been the slightest attention paid by the present Government to the question of establishing an experimental farm. I cannot impress this on the minister too emphatically. The country is one that requires teaching. The same kind of farming will not do there as is employed around Regina or Calgary or Lethbridge or Edmonton. It is a country all by itself. In years when we have lots of rain and the crops turn out favourably the people are well off, but they need to be taught how to farm under other conditions. In southwest Saskatchewan, for twenty years, while the rest of Saskatchewan was being settled, that country was looked on as a purely ranching district. But now the railways have gone in there, towns have sprung up and it is becoming thickly settled. The minister may say that he has established a farm in Alberta. That does not fill the bill. In the first place I do not think the establishment of that farm is a serious attempt to solve the problem. The Lethbridge country, where that farm is situated, is largely an irrigation district, in fact the experimental farm there is partly an irrigation farm. True, at that farm there is some kind of lecturing on dry farming, but, in the first place, it is too far away from us; it is altogether out of our line of travel; our homesteaders have no chance or purpose to take them into south Alberta; and, apart from that, it is a different kind of farming from what is required in southern Saskatchewan.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE: Is it not a demonstration farm that you want?

Mr. KNOWLES: I am not familiar with the technical terms used in the department. What I want is a demonstration farm all

right. We want a farm that will demonstrate how to farm under the circumstances.

Mr. SHARPE: Like the one at Indian Head.

Mr. KNOWLES: That would be splendid; even a smaller one would do. The late Government when it went out was on the point of purchasing a farm in the district I speak of. Perhaps the minister does not even know that the establishment of an experimental farm 75 miles southwest of Moosejaw was authorized by the late minister.

Mr. BURRELL: I am not aware of that.

Mr. KNOWLES: The money was not voted and the arrangement did not go through. If the minister had taken enough interest to investigate he would have found out that the late Government had even arranged to secure a farm southwest of Moosejaw to demonstrate, as well as the Government could demonstrate, the method of farming which would be most profitable in that country. I feel that I need offer no apology for taking up time to discuss this subject, which is of tremendous importance not only to that province but to the whole of Canada. If the new homesteaders do not learn a successful method of farming they will be in a terrible state. With the markets closed against them and the taxes piled on them that this Government has put on, why I feel sorry for them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is all right to laugh. There was not a foot of that country surveyed when I became a member, and it was on my recommendation that it was surveyed. So I feel that I have a special interest in those settlers, every one of whom has gone in there while I was the representative of that district, and I would feel a small representative if I did nothing but sit here and laugh when their wants are mentioned in this House. With markets closed against them, with the taxes piled on them, with the banks and implement firms grinding them under their heels, it is a terrible condition and the least I can do is to ask that the minister should establish without any delay a good demonstration farm in that new country to the southwest of Moosejaw and, if possible, show the most profitable use to which that land can be put and the most favourable method of farming in that district. I make this suggestion in all friendliness to my hon. friend

the minister and would be glad to have him to take it up.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I think the great difficulty was that the land should never have been opened for homesteading at all, and that the fault lies entirely with the late Government. There is a section of country there that formerly was occupied by ranchers, and I think experience will prove that the land should not have been opened for homesteading.

Mr. KNOWLES: You might say that all of Saskatchewan, Moosejaw and Souris, and all that country, was formerly occupied by Indians and should be kept by them.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I understood the hon. member to say that there was a difference in the conditions in southwestern Saskatchewan and that that was why an experimental farm was needed to demonstrate how that section of country should be farmed. Everybody knows why settlers did not go into that country. Why was it necessary to give a purchased homestead or an extra pre-emption? Because it was clearly manifest that they considered the land was not like the other land in the three western provinces. There is no question about that, and it is being proven to-day that that section of country should never have been opened for homesteaders.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I remember the day when there were pamphlets circulated by high authority stating that wheat could not be grown in the valley of the Red river above Fort Garry. All these theories have been proved to be untrue. The same may be true also of the section of country referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not think the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) need apologize for bringing this matter to the attention of the House or to my own notice. I may say that all of these things are being attended to. Although I am not a representative of a constituency on the western prairie, I am fairly familiar with the conditions all through that district, and I have as warm a sympathy as any man can have with the settlers there, as I have been closely identified with agriculture in a practical way for many years. I am strongly desirous, as the Government is, of relieving the conditions as far as the Government can do so. There are now three experimental farms in Saskatchewan: one at Indian Head, which has rendered excellent service to the

country, under the direction of Mr. McKay, another at Scott, and a third at Rosthern. The last two have been extended in order to do more experimental work with stock. I quite admit that they have not quite fulfilled the needs of the southern country to which my hon. friend alludes. Every part of the country naturally would like to see a demonstration or experimental farm established in a particular county. We have hesitated for some time because we have always had the feeling that with the Federal Government lies particularly the duty of carrying on experimental work for the whole country, whereas showing by object lesson, in a practical way, how to carry out the results of these experiments is more the part of the provinces. It is purely for that reason that we have hesitated from year to year about invading that field. Manitoba, British Columbia, Ontario, and I think some of the other provinces have done a certain amount of work in that direction. Last year I was asked by the Prime Minister to interview both the Alberta and the Saskatchewan governments, and to investigate as far as I could the conditions in the drouth-stricken area. That investigation brought home to my mind the fact that conditions there were extraordinary, and that something would have to be done. I am not going into the question raised by my hon. friend whether it was wise or not to open up that large district. That is a debatable point. But it has been opened up, and is now largely settled. They have schools and all kinds of municipal activities, and I hardly see how any government could abandon the country. We have, therefore, to do the best we can to develop it, and I think we were thoroughly justified in taking up this demonstration work. My hon. friend suggests that I have not given any attention to that kind of work, but I want to assure him that we have given it our most sympathetic and earnest attention. I went into the question very fully during the five or six weeks prior to going to California, and made up my mind to establish twenty or thirty demonstration stations all through that dry belt in southern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta. Our Director of Farms has been out there, together with two very capable young graduates of Manitoba College who are to assist him in the work. We expect these twenty or thirty stations to be thoroughly organized and in work this year, our object being simply to prove to the farmers of that country that if proper methods of rotation are followed they will, even in a dry season, be able to get at least some crop. In that connection, I may say that when I was looking over the drouth-stricken district, I saw right next to farms that had not a single spear of grain other farms, which having been properly summer-fallowed, had as much as fifteen or twenty bushels to the acre. I quite appreciate the fact that a great many of the farmers who have gone out there know little about the conditions of the country, and that it is up to us to do something; and I sincerely hope that the work which we have already started will be of some practical value to these people, and enable them to hold on to what they have got and make better use of it.

Mr. KNOWLES: I thank the minister for what he has stated. I should like to ask if this vote will include the organizing of these farms?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: As this is certainly a new departure, I think the minister should have told us something about it on the introduction of his Estimates.

Mr. BURRELL: This is the introduction of my Estimates.

Mr. KNOWLES: The introduction is getting pretty near the end. Perhaps the minister would tell us where these farms will be, who is going to buy them, and whether they will be operated this year?

Mr. BURRELL: I have been away for the last six weeks, and so am not very familiar with the details. But before I went to California I had outlined the whole work. This demonstration work is in one sense a new policy, but in another it is not. The experimental farm system, even under the late Government, has always included a certain amount of demonstration as well as experimental work; so that really it is not a new principle, but an extension of a principle that has always been recognized. We do not propose to buy any of these farms, but to select forty or fifty acres in a thoroughly typical section of each of these districts. We shall choose stations that will be get-at-able by all the farmers in the district, and put in charge the man who already owns that land, and who will be a practical, sound farmer. He will have to carry out our instructions as regards the routine of crops, and we shall keep a complete record of the work. The expense will be small; about $400 or $500

for each plot. I am hopeful that this policy will benefit the people of the whole country, and that we shall get the work thoroughly started this year.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the land be rented, and the Government own the crop; will the work be done by day labour, and will these college boys have charge of it?

Mr. BURRELL: I said that we were sending out two graduates of Manitoba College to assist in the work. The director, who knows the conditions out there pretty well, will of course be at the head of the work, and under him will be Mr. John Fixter, who is a thoroughly practical and reliable man, and who for the last few years has been with the Conservation Commission. He will be largely responsible for the work. I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend all the details, but I think my hon. friend from Calgary, who has been out there lately, may have more recent information than I have and may be able to enlighten my hon. friend.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: With the observations made by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) I think most of us who live in the West are very heartily in accord. We realize that in order to get successful results we must have two things: first, good seed; and, second, proper cultivation. Dr. Rutherford, who is in charge of the agricultural work in connection with the Canadian Pacific's undertaking near Calgary, pointed out only recently that while those farmers in the drouth-stricken area who had not properly cultivated their soil had failed with their crops twice, other farmers in that same district who had properly cultivated their soil and done the necessary summer-fallowing, had been able to obtain a crop under the most adverse conditions. Many of us have pointed out to the Minister of Agriculture and the Government the necessity of establishing some demonstration plots throughout the territory; not experimental farms, as the hon. gentleman has just suggested, not a utilization in the first instance of what the hon. member for Kings has described as college and academic men, but rather the utilization of the good farmer in every district. For there is always in every district a good farmer, some man who is a better husbandman than his neighbour, who cultivates his soil more properly, who selects his seed with care, who estimates weeds, and whose crop gives better results. We all know this kind of farmer; and the idea of the department, so far as I understand it, is to use the farm of such a man for the demonstration station. Mr. Grisdale, who is well known to us all, and Mr. Fixter, who was with the Conservation Commission, have been sent out to look over the drouth-stricken area, and select 40 acres at points that will be visible to every person passing along the main travelled highway. They will pay the farmer who owns that 40 acres a small sum, for he has to plant the seed and cultivate the ground in the manner that is indicated as best by the men who are supervising the work for the Department of Agriculture. The Government will buy the seed, under certain conditions, and the crop will belong to the farmer. The idea is to show what good seed and good cultivation will do. It is to be an ocular demonstration, which, after all, is the best kind of demonstration, of what good seed and good farming will accomplish in any locality. I was out West only a few days ago, and I understand that Mr. Grisdale has been going over the territory and selecting twenty-five or thirty points at which to establish these demonstration plots. These plots will be in charge, not of college men, as has been suggested, but of the farmers who have been getting the best results in their own particular locality. This kind of farmer is to be asked to permit the use of 40 acres of his land for a visible demonstration of what good farming will do. That is how I understand the matter from my discussions with the director, who is now out West.

Of course, there would be none of them in my particular locality. They are all south of that in the drouth-stricken area because it was decided by the Government that in the area east of Calgary the Canadian Pacific railway was carrying on that class of work, and that the Government need not duplicate it in these places. Neither will this work be carried on at points where the local government has small demonstration plots, such as that at Medicine Hat. In the territory of my hon. friend from Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) there are two or three such plots, and I think the director told me that he was arranging to establish one or two in the locality to which the hon. member from Moosejaw has referred, but the difficulty was, having started the plans last fall, to find a particular piece of land that was in such a state of cultivation that it might be used to afford an accurate demonstration to the rest of the community, of what may be done by proper cultivation and good seed.

I think the real value of these demonstration plots cannot be overestimated. If

I had my way in western Canada, I would see a thousand of them established in the two provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan within a very short time. That sounds very extreme, but when you come to think of the enormous area of these two provinces and when you come to think of the kind of settlers we are bringing in, my idea is not far wrong. We are bringing men to our land who are not used to cultivation of that particular kind of soil; men who have not been able to understand the true value of good seed and who are not themselves able to make those experiments which are necessary to get the best results. The Government has placed at the disposal of the settlers a seed-germinating laboratory, and they have given that supervision and instruction which is essential for the purpose of obtaining the best results. We provide for these settlers small demonstration plots—as I have said, I hope there will be a thousand of them in the two western provinces before many years—which afford visible evidence, which is the best evidence, to the farmers of the locality of what may be accomplished by good husbandry, proper cultivation, and good seed, and this will cost the country little or nothing.

Mr. KNOWLES: The arrangement is only for one year at a time.

Mr. BENNETT: That was what was originally proposed, but I understand it is to be extended for a period of three years.

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, for three years.

Mr. BENNETT: Three years was the period mentioned for the purpose of establishing what would be the best system of rotation of crops, it being felt that if you merely took a piece of land for one year and took a crop off it, you would not be able to indicate to the settlers of that locality what would be the best rotation of crops to secure the best results in the cultivation of the land there. I feel very sanguine as to the results which will come from this. I am very hopeful that in northern Alberta, where there are very large numbers of Galician settlers, the establishment of such demonstration plots will do the very greatest amount of good, because these men are really ambitious to make good farmers. I have observed that a large proportion of our foreign population shows perhaps the greatest ambition to become good farmers, but the difficulty they experience is to understand exactly what is the best rotation of crops, how best to summer fallow, and how to get the best results from proper cultivation. I think this experiment will teach them that. This experiment, small though it is, and only involving twenty-five or thirty demonstration plots, is in my judgment a move in the right direction and one that will do incalculable benefit to our western country.

I am satisfied that if we are to continue a wild system of settlement in the West we will not obtain any commensurate results for the money we expend. The day of people settling far remote from railways where neighbours are ten miles apart, must pass, and the only hope we have is to bring about a system of settlement in the West which will be based upon a scientific principle, whereby townships will be settled with proper settlers and demonstration plots will be established throughout those townships, so that there will be a real incentive to men to do the very best that is in them, and to obtain the very best possible results from the cultivation of the soil. It will also, in my judgment, lead to the establishment of a sort of social centre in these townships whereby the loneliness incident to the system of settlement followed up to the present time will pass away, and so that there will be happiness and comfort to those who are homesteading in these townships. Without some broad, comprehensive, and far-reaching settlement scheme in western Canada. I look for no great progress along the line of increase of population of a permanent and staple nature. I welcome this experiment, and I think everybody in the West does, as being a move that must inevitably result in a better and more comprehensive scheme of settlement, the introduction of a better system of husbandry, and, more content, more happiness, and what perhaps is of more value still, greater wealth to the state.

Mr. KNOWLES: I thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) for giving us this information, but I think the minister should be possessed of the details of this a little better, because he has been back from California quite a while and he has his deputy beside him to give him the information. I think the minister shows a little absence of that tense interest he should have in such a serious problem, but no doubt he has been busy with other things. I am not going to say I am against this scheme; in fact I would like to see the minister do a great deal more than this. I was sorry to hear the minister say: I do not see how we could abandon that country

and these people. The very suggestion of abandoning that country is a joke. It is a grand country; there is no need of the minister saying: We would think of abandoning it but we do not dare to.

Mr. BURRELL: I cannot allow that statement of the hon. member to go unchallenged. I have made no suggestion about abandoning that country. What I stated was that the Prime Minister asked me to interview the people in the West when the suggestion was made here and there that the country might better not have been settled, and when it was an open question with some as to whether it would pay to go on developing it. My view was that such an idea could not be entertained for one moment, and that we should go on with our work in that district. I never thought of suggesting that it should be abandoned.

Mr. KNOWLES: I took the minister's words down and he certainly referred to a suggestion about abandoning the country.

Mr. BURRELL: I am sure my hon. friend does not want to do me an injustice.

Mr. KNOWLES: Absolutely no, and I do not think the minister ever thought of abandoning it, but he should not speak as if he thought of such a thing because it will give a wrong impression. As for the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) saying that the country should not have been settled, I say it is as good a district as the average district in the West, and it will do itself credit in a few years when the people really get on their feet. They went in there poor people, they have met with great hardships and reverses, they have been away from railways, they have had to haul their flax and wheat seventy or eighty miles, but in spite of it all they have stood up four-square to every wind that blew, and to-day they are doing well there, despite everything else except the drouth which came on this year, when they expected to pay off their debts. The idea of saying it is a debatable point whether the country ever should have been opened up is too absurd to be mentioned in this House. It is a splendid country. South of Moosejaw fifty miles and southwest of Gravelbourg they had this year very good crops and there is no relief work there. But further west the rains did not come this year, and if you are going to lay that down as a reason for abandoning them or saying that the country should never have been opened up, then there is an enormous part of Canada which has towns, and railways, and churches, and everything else that the people may well clear out of. Surely we are not going to say, because we have had the worst year for fifteen or sixteen years, that a district so stricken is to be deserted.

I do not understand the scheme well enough to be able to approve of it or to criticise it. It seems a kind of buckshot proposition, a little scattering here and there. I do not think many of my constituents will go to see how another farmer twenty or thirty miles away, is going to cultivate a small plot, and I think the Government would have been better advised had they established real experimental farms situated near a railway, which the people would think it worth while to visit.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That would be too academic. They want to have the farmer himself do this work under proper supervision.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not think it would be too academic. The minister was once a very fine lecturer on agriculture, and see what a fine robust man he is to-day—a typical farmer, every inch of him. I do not think that, because a man has been through an agricultural college, he is any worse a farmer.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The fact that a man has been through a university does not make him a lawyer.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not think it keeps him from being a lawyer either; and if it does not help him, it certainly does not hurt him. These demonstration plots will be such little, picayune affairs—I hope they will not be, but if you are going to scatter about twenty of them over the prairies, you are going to have something which perhaps one or two neighbours will look at, but which it will not be worth any one leaving his work and going far to see.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: A farmer will have to pass one of these plots every day he goes to market. It is going to be situated on a highway and usually at a corner, so that as he goes to market, even if he does not want to see it, he will have to see it willy-nilly.

Mr. KNOWLES: I understand the whole matter. In my district, which is about 200 miles long by 200 miles wide, there will be two of these plots.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I was speaking only from very hazy knowledge.

Mr. KNOWLES: Well, suppose there are half-a-dozen stuck in my district. The number of people, who will pass a certain corner and see the plot there willy-nilly will be a very small proportion of the people in my large constituency.

Mr. EDWARDS: A still smaller proportion would see the thoroughly-equipped experimental farms that my hon. friend advocates.

Mr. KNOWLES: My hon. friend has a right to his own opinions, but I do not entertain that view. Thousands of people go to our Indian Head experimental farm every year.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The difficulty that I have found in the West is this: The Canadian Pacific have been carrying on large experiments; and as that company has a great deal of money, the average farmer has said to me: "They are absolutely no good to me, Mr. Bennett, because the Canadian Pacific has lots of money; I want something demonstrated that I can do with the limited capital that I have." That is what has brought me down to the position I now occupy of advocating demonstration plots, so that the man of small capital and limited means may be able to see what his neighbour similarly situated has been able to accomplish with good seed under proper supervision.

Mr. KNOWLES: My hon. friend is begging the question. I do not think it follows, that because money is spent on a farm on a large scale, the education derived from that farm is any the less.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what the farmer sometimes thinks.

Mr. KNOWLES: I must take exception to that. As regards my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), I think people will go to experimental farms. In my district we have special excursions to the Indian Head experimental farm from all parts of the compass. Husbands and their wives and children come to the experimental farm in large numbers; and the women look at the things that interest them, such as shade trees, poultry, dairy produce, etc., and the men at anything that interests them, until it is time to return. It is idle to say that men will not go to experimental farms. If that is the custom in Ontario, perhaps the people there are so dashed wise that they will not learn anything; but while the people in my district are willing to go to experimental farms, I am sure they will not go very much out of their way to see this little bit of a plot which the hon. member for Calgary says they must see willy or nilly when they go to market.

Mr. BENNETT: Not willy, nor nilly-willy-nilly.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am sorry I had not the gentleman's name right, but the Hansard man will get it correct.

Mr. EDWARDS: It seems to me the hon. member has concerned himself more with the question whether the Department of Agriculture of the Government is going to do something that will be a credit to the Government than he has about the farmers.

Mr. KNOWLES: I did not catch that.

Mr. EDWARDS: You will see it in Hansard to-morrow.

Mr. KNOWLES: I thank the hon. gentleman for his courtesy. I will not be bothered looking, because I know it is no good anyway.

Mr. EDWARDS: It will, of course, be in the judgment of the House whether it is or not. I was referring to something that the hon. member said, and of course it is quite possible it was not of much value.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition, in advocating a farm for the clay-belt, touched a very important point in connection with this whole question; that is, he referred to the climate and the general conditions in that part of the country as being so different, for instance, from what they are at Ottawa or at Guelph, that an experimental farm at Guelph or at Ottawa is really of very little use to that part of the country. We have a very large country with a comparatively small population, and we are far behind other countries in regard to experimental work along agricultural lines; perhaps not so far behind them when you compare this country with others on the basis of population; but we have to consider the vast areas and the differences of climate and of soil. I am entirely in sympathy with this move on the part of the Minister of Agriculture. I suggested something along the same line, I think, two or three years ago, in speaking of this very subject. It seems to me that our whole agricultural education should be systematized in something the same way as our general education is; that is to say, that as the primary school is a step to the high

school or the collegiate institute, and the high school a step to the university, so our education along agricultural lines should work out in the same manner; that is, the fully-equipped experimental farm should be the university for agriculture. If you are going to reach the mass of the people with information that will be of benefit to them, you are not going to do it by sending out agricultural bulletins, no matter how valuable the information in them may be, because hardly one out of five hundred farmers reads those bulletins. It is also absolutely true beyond a shadow of a doubt that the general farmer looks upon an experimental farm as something beyond him. He says: "Lots of money is spent on that farm, and I cannot hope with my limited means to do as the experimental farm is doing." In the province of Ontario in recent years the Government has done a great deal of good by sending men out to do experimental work, such as demonstrating in this neighbourhood and that neighbourhood, fifteen or twenty or thirty miles apart, how to preserve their orchards by spraying, how to get rid of certain weeds by spraying at certain seasons, and so on. Such things are educating the pepole; the farmers have an opportunity of seeing them, and they feel that they can imitate them. The general farmer does not feel that he has the means at his disposal to imitate the work carried on at experimental farms. It is true that occasionally, say once or twice a year, an excursion may be got up to visit an experimental farm, and some of the farmers, who perhaps have the means and want a holiday, will take in that excursion. They see a great many things in a few hours, and they go away confirmed in the idea that it is impossible for them to imitate what tney have seen at that farm. I would like to see this work carried on in the manner the minister has indicated that he intends to carry it on in the West. He wants to have some twenty or thirty stations; but I would like to see that system spread throughout the Dominion of Canada. I would not stop at 1,000 or at 2,000 of those small experimental plots. If you had 10,000 of them scattered throughout this country, in every constituency, you would get splendid value for every dollar that was spent.

In various European countries they have carried their work on agricultural lines very much further than we have in this country. The result is shown in the statistics of crop returns, not only in grain but in roots as well. It seems to me we acted wisely in establishing experimental farms here and there in the country to carry on experiments and give the people the benefit of the knowledge they gained. But the people ought also to have the benefit of these little demonstration stations, and these stations should be as numerous as possible. I think the money would bring a big return in the form of a larger yield and in the encouragement it would give to the agricultural population. And that is another element that should be considered. If the minister can succeed in demonstrating in the West that crops can be raised in that drouth district by proper cultivation, it will not be merely one or two or a dozen men going by who will learn and benefit. It is not going to stop there, because, say what you will of the farmer, he is always ready to impart his information to his neighbour. If he has made a success in cultivating his fields in a certain way, he will tell his neighbour; he does not try to keep the information to himself. So, if at these demonstration farms a hundred farmers see and learn the proper course to follow, the information will not benefit these people alone, but they will carry it to hundreds of others. I am heartily in sympathy with this plan, and I hope the minister will carry it out and will establish these smaller demonstration stations throughout the East as well as throughout the West.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris): I do not wish to take up much of the time of the committee, but as this is a subject on which I have had something to say in other sessions, I desire to say a few words now. The late Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Fisher, and I used to have a friendly combat every time his Estimates came up as to the utility of experimental farms and the best way of getting to the people the benefits those experimental farms could give.

The plan outlined by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) is not exactly an experiment. I have not a word to say against the general and large experimental farms that have been established in various parts of this country; I believe they have been of great service to the agriculturists of Canada. But we have had these great experimental farms for many years—at Ottawa, at Brandon, at Indian Head, and elsewhere. It did not seem to me that we were getting value, at any rate in western Canada—I say nothing about eastern Canada—for the money expended on these experimental farms. One

suggestion has been made to which we have referred before. The experimental farm in Manitoba is situated on the bank of a river, on soil different from any other in the province except, perhaps, in one locality.

Now, I am not taking any credit to myself for the adoption of the plan outlined this morning; nevertheless, in justice to myself—and the proof of what I say will be found in Hansard—this plan is identical with or very similar to a plan which I outlined and tried to influence the late Minister of Agriculture to adopt. Soil varies, as my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has said. And that gentleman may say what he likes, he may be as flippant as he pleases about that country to which we have been referring, but the fact is that climatic conditions and soil conditions there are different, perhaps from those of any other place in western Canada. That being so, a different system of farming must be adopted in order to attain success. And that is exactly why we should have these demonstration farms. One experimental farm in the province of Manitoba, situated on a peculiar soil—a splendid soil, none better in the world—would not give to the farmers who live on a different soil, one with more gravel, if you like, or different in some other way, the example and information that they should have in working their land. I used to say to Mr. Fisher, in the kind way in which I always speak, that I thought he should establish demonstration farms.

It has been said here this morning that you can have excursions to your experimental farms. So you can; and it is a good thing and is being adopted more and more. But, nevertheless, here is the experience—and experience is what you can depend upon—both at Brandon and at Indian Head, that very few farmers avail themselves of the excursions to the experimental farms. I have had conversations with Mr. Grisdale about it. I said: "If you cannot get the farmers to come to the experimental farm, you must take the experimental or demonstration farm to the farmers." They are doing that in Manitoba. But who is doing it? The local government. The provincial Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. George Lawrence, has established within the last year or two something like twenty-five of these demonstration farms. They are exactly as outlined by the hon. member for Calgary. Each farm is forty acres in extent. The land is not bought, but is leased by one of the best farmers within a mile or two of the town. The Government fences it and also supplies the seed in order to be assured that that seed is the very best; and the Government has supervision. The farmer who operates the farm gets no pay, but I think is permitted to have the crop raised on the forty-acre plot.

Now, the farmers in our country, of whatever political party, recognize the importance of that demonstration plot. I have never heard one adverse criticism of it. They think it is the best policy that has yet been launched in the interest of the farmer. But it comes from that progressive province in which I have the honour to live, and which has given so many progressive ideas and policies to the western provinces. Take the railway policy, and the telephone policy, and now the demonstration farm policy—they all originated in the province of Manitoba; and I am glad to say, in the interests of western Canada, that they have all been successful.

We have another idea which, I dare say, has been adopted in Alberta and Saskatchewan, and which with us has proven very successful. We have an agricultural college in Winnipeg, just as you have an agricultural college in Guelph, of whose work we hear glowing accounts. But there was the same difficulty that I have been speaking about in the other case: you could not get the people to this agricultural college, it was too expensive. But in Manitoba—and I do not know but what the same is done in Ontario—they take the agricultural college to the farmers. A train is supplied free by the different railways, and is fitted up practically like the college at Winnipeg or Guelph. That train goes from town to town, its arrival being advertised ahead. So far as my town of Boissevain is concerned, I never knew that train to come in but there were from two hundred to four hundred people, men, women and children, who came to Boissevain to see the results attained by the agricultural college in Winnipeg, and these people have always gone away well pleased with what they saw and convinced that this policy of the touring agricultural college was one eminently in the interest of the people at large.

If a municipality in Manitoba wants to establish one of these agricultural plots—and our municipalities are, on the average, about 18 miles square—they have only to make application to the provincial Minister of Agriculture. I believe that this plan is identical with the plan outlined by the hon. member for Calgary. I am glad that the Minister of Agriculture

has seen fit to adopt this plan, and I believe it will prove entirely successful.

Mr. BRADBURY: So far as the northern part of the province of Manitoba is concerned, experimental farms are of very little use, but demonstration farms are of the utmost importance. I believe that if we could induce this Government to clear dozens of tracts of land in the northern part of Manitoba and to start demonstration farms there, the work would prove of very great value to the people in that district. Some of the land in that part of the province is very difficult of cultivation. Much of it is covered with scrub timber. The settlers who have gone in there, while they are first-class men, are not always in good financial circumstances, and, without encouragement, it is almost impossible for them to make headway. I have advocated time after time that some comprehensive scheme should be adopted by the Government with a view to assisting these people to acquire and settle these lands. It has been said that I have advocated a paternal government, but I think the time is coming when the Government of Canada should be more paternal than it has been in respect of the farmers. The land in the northern part of Manitoba is, I believe, destined to become the most valuable land in the northwest country, but, owing to the nature of the soil, it cannot be successfully worked unless the Government comes to the assistance of the people. I would not advocate the 40-acre plots in my own district, but I would advocate the Government's taking up 10-acre plots in different parts of the northern portion of the province, clearing them and putting them under cultivation in order to show these people the possibilities of the land. If this were done, I am sure that the Government would be amply repaid in a very short time, and that the settlers in that part of the country would very soon become a thoroughly independent and prosperous community. I would call the attention of the minister also to the fact that the northern portion of the province is well adapted to dairying, but the people in the district being poor, they require some assistance in order that their efforts along this line may become productive. I have advocated, and I advocate now, that the Government of the country should make it possible for these men to secure sufficient stock to start them in the dairying business. If this were done, in a short time these non-productive districts would become productive, and every dollar of the money expended by the Government in the way of stock and the clearing of the land would be repaid. I would strongly urge upon the Minister of Agriculture the advisability of his devoting some little attention to assisting the farmers in this part of the province. I agree with what the hon. member for Souris has said with regard to the efforts of the Manitoba Government in establishing these demonstration farms. Some of them have been established in my own county, and in every case they have proved to be of great value. But the finances of the provincial government are limited, and I believe that the Dominion Government ought to come to the assistance of the people and do some of the work that the provincial government is not able to do. In my own county we have brought in some 30,000 or 40,000 foreigners. These people deserve encouragement and assistance in order that they may become self-sustaining and prosperous. I wish to impress upon the committee the fact that these people are industrious and thrifty; they are doing all that men can do to become good citizens and prosperous farmers, and this they will do if they receive encouragement and assistance from the Government.

Mr. BUCHANAN: We have discussed this session many matters concerning the district known as the drouth district in Saskatchewan and Alberta, but I question whether any matter that we have taken up in that connection is of as much importance as the question which we have under consideration at the present time. Personally I am in favour of experimental farms, but I am also inclined to believe in the demonstration plot idea which the minister has in view. As to the experimental farm at Lethbridge I would not say that the conditions which exist at Lethbridge are exactly similar to those which exist from that point to the Saskatchewan boundary and thence on towards Moosejaw. I have had this complaint from the farmers about the experimental farms. You may tell the farmer that the experimental farm had a good crop while in his own district there was a failure. His argument is that at the experimental farm they have all the facilities for practising farming on a proper scale, they can afford the labour and can put in the crops at the proper seasons and test them all the way through, and so are bound to get a crop of some kind. A a matter of fact, in that drouth district this year there were farmers who had crops because

they happened to get their land in shape, they had summer-fallowed it and got it seeded in the proper time and were able to have crops of 15 bushels to the acre in a district where farmers for miles around did not have a crop of any kind. The experimental plot idea is necessary in my particular district for the reason that the climatic and soil conditions are so varied all through that country, within 100 miles of Lethbridge. In the district of Macleod there were crops this year towards the foothills, in the Pincher Creek country and also along the Calgary and Edmonton line. They had not very large crops, but at the same time they had something. In my own district around Cardston, near Lethbridge, they had crops, and north and west along the Carmangay line of the Canadian Pacific railway they had crops which in some cases were very good. Yet there were instances in that district where farmers did not have anything whatever. I think that the experimental plot idea has a good deal to commend it. At the same time I believe in the experimental farm, I believe it is helpful in giving the farmers directions as to the proper method to follow in their particular district.

As to what has been said by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), I can understand people losing hope about the future of that country owing to the crop failure this year. I have discussed that matter in the House this session and have instanced other sections of Canada and sections of the United States, where similar conditions was met in the early days and overcome. I have hope and I believe that much can be done by proper education of the farmer ; if the farmer, for instance, had had the proper idea about farming methods in that country when he went in there in the beginning he would not have required relief this year. I have been told that by farmers that if they had known how to farm properly when they went in they would have made enough out of their operations during the time they had been there prior to last year to have put themselves in a safe position to carry them through such a crisis. I have known in that district good yields from seeding on stubble. For a few years farmers there thought they could raise a crop of grain by throwing seed helter skelter over the land because they had ideal conditions, and farmers in many cases seeded on stubble. I have even known volunteer crops of 12 to 15 bushels to the acre, and that made the farmers think they could do anything with the land there and it would yield a crop. But they have met with adverse conditions and these adverse conditions are driving them to adopt a system of farming which I am satisfied will be successful in that district. These very adverse conditions are going to be helpful to farmers, in southern Alberta at any rate. The summer-fallowing idea has only been adopted within the last year or two, and where it was adopted last year there were in a great many cases crops of some kind. I believe that that idea, properly practised and followed out, will result in a great deal of success in farming in that part of the country. As for the future of the district, I would mention that in Saskatchewan, in what is known as the Qu'Appelle valley, I have been told that people left the country in the early 80's and on towards the early 90's, because they had to face adverse conditions, thought the country was not any good; and yet today that country is considered the most fertile district in Saskatchewan. In Manitoba exactly the same conditions were faced by the farmers in the early days of farming in that province. These conditions are being faced in southern Alberta and in southern Saskatchewan. I believe that history will prove that the opening of the country was warranted and that as soon as the farmers acquire the proper knowledge of how to farm in those sections of Alberta and Saskatchewan they will meet with success in their operations. I believe that we should have an experimental farm in the heart of the affected country, and also that the establishment of experimental plots throughout that particular country or for that matter in any part of Canada will be helpful to agriculture.

Mr. McCRANEY: The minister referred to the fact that some additional land had been purchased for the farm at Rosthern. Would he give the House the particulars of that purchase? He announced last summer that a quarter-section or a half-section had been bought.

Mr. BURRELL: I will give it at three o'clock. I have not the exact details now.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the minister give a brief summary of what is being done in the province of Quebec by his department especially with regard to Ste. Anne de la Pocatière?

Mr. BURRELL: We are carrying on the work at Cap Rouge and at Ste. Anne de la

Pocatière and at Lennoxville in the Eastern Townships, where we have recently established a farm. We are increasing the work at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière. We are carrying on the work on the usual lines of experimental work at all these stations and are endeavouring to extend the work and help those sections of the country more than before.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the work at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière confined to the farm itself or is it extended to the surrounding country?

Mr. BURRELL: A good deal of the work is confined, as always, to the experimental farm; but in so far as our officers can make known the results that they are achieving to the farmers of the neighbouring district it is their business to do so, and if hon. members say that this is not being done, that every effort is not being made to render that farm beneficial to the country, I will be only too glad to take the matter up.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister give an idea of the chief experiments being made at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière?

Mr. BURRELL: I think there as at the other farms, they have carried on the various branches of animal husbandry, live stock raising, soil fertilization, rotation of crops and everything that in common parlance is known as advanced agricultural methods. I do not know that we are carrying out any particular lines of work there that we are not carrying out at most of our experimental stations in other districts.

Mr. MARCIL: How are the results communicated to the farmers in the district?

Mr. BURRELL: The chief way we have of reaching the farmers generally who cannot visit the farm is by our farm report. This, in the case of Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, is a special report from the superintendent giving the result of all the experimental work, giving the exact conditions on the farm. That report every farmer who is at all interested is entitled to receive, he is put on the mailing list and gets complete copies of the whole work. If he requires any special bulletins we are only too happy to put him on the list and give him every bulletin in which he is interested.

Mr. MARCIL: Have the farmers to apply to the farm?

Mr. BURRELL: Either to the farm there or to the central farm here. The farmer can apply to be put on the list for all reports or for any special reports in which he is interested.

Mr. MARCIL: I have always contended that as there is a great difference in climate and geographical situation between the two constituencies of Gaspé and Bonaventure and the place on the St. Lawrence where the experimental farm is, Bonaventure and Gaspé being much further south and nearer to the Maritime Provinces, there should be a demonstration farm of some kind either in Bonaventure or Gaspé. Some years ago New Carlisle was suggested as a suitable location for such a farm. Perhaps the minister may see his way clear to giving us such a farm. I must say a good word of the department for what it has done in my province in assisting the dairying industry, which is becoming quite an important one down there. The department sent down the Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner, and he has been of considerable assistance to the various butter factories that have recently been established in my constituency; and other butter factories are being started this year. A number of lecturers have also been sent down to deliver lectures in the parishes of Gaspé and Bonaventure, and I should like to know whether the minister intends to follow up the good seed that has been thus sown, or are the department's efforts to end with the lectures?

Mr. BURRELL: I know my hon. friend takes a very lively interest in that part of the country. But he understands that owing to the financial condition of this country at the present time we hesitate to plunge in large expenditures, even for agriculture; although I must cordially acknowledge that the Minister of Finance and my other colleagues have not held up their hands in regard to this department. But we felt that there was at this moment a special need for this kind of work in the West, that no matter how strained the finances might be the Government was absolutely warranted in doing something for those particular districts in the West. Later on I hope we may be able to do this sort of work in other parts of the country, including those portions of Quebec where the settlers are in considerable need of more advanced methods. I can assure my hon. friend that the matter will not be forgotten.

At one o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Experimental farms—maintenance of Central Farm, and establishment and maintaining of additional branch stations, $785,000.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND: I doubt if there is a single vote in all these Estimates that is of greater importance to the people of Canada than that which we are now discussing. While to-day there has been a good deal of discussion on this vote by the representatives from various provinces, very little has been said so far by hon. gentlemen who represent Ontario constituencies. I wish to emphasize what has already been said as to the importance of experimental and demonstration farms. I believe that the Minister of Agriculture has acted wisely in providing for the extension of agricultural instruction in this direction, and I feel quite sure that no expenditure of public money in Canada will give better results than will the expenditure of this $785,000. I may say that personally I would like to see a much larger appropriation for this purpose. We have heard a great deal in recent years about educating the farmer in the science of their industry, and I am satisfied that these small demonstration farms or plots will accomplish better results than possibly any other scheme, because through them you bring directly under the eyes of the farms what can be done by the study and practice of advanced agricultural methods.

I was amused at the remarks of the hon. member from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) to the effect that agricultural education of this kind was probably a custom in the province of Ontario, where the people were so "dashed" wise, as he said. I do not think the people of Ontario deserve that sneering remark from the hon. member. They have been the pioneers in agricultural education in this country, and shortly after Confederation, John Carling, afterwards Sir John Carling, then Commissioner of Agriculture in the Government of John Sanfield Macdonald, established the Ontario Agricultural College, the reputation of which has always stood high in Ontario, in Canada, and, I may say, throughout the world. From the day of its establishment to the present hour, the province of Ontario has paid cheerfully all the expenses in connection with that institution, which has trained more men in the science of agriculture than probably any other institution in the world. And yet the hon. member for Moosejaw finds it not beneath him to sneer at the people of Ontario. When Sir John Carling was Minister of Agriculture in the Government of Sir John Macdonald, he established the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa, and shortly afterwards there were established experimental farms at Nappan, for the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, it being situated near the boundary of these two provinces; at Indian Head, for the Northwest Territories; and at Agassiz, for British Columbia. For twenty-five years afterwards not an experimental or a demonstration farm was established in the whole of Canada, until in 1911, when several others were brought into being. Let me call attention to the fact that from that time down to the past year not one experimental farm was established in the great province of Ontario. Session after session I have taken this matter up, and I have urged on the Government the necessity of doing justice to the province of Ontario in this respect. I am glad to see that since last session the Minister of Agriculture has made arrangements to establish a demonstration farm in Northern Ontario, along the line of the Transcontinental railway. That part of our province suffered severely through a report that was made by a man who was sent out by the Conservation Commission a few years ago, who went along the line of the Transcontinental railway in a motor car, and made a report which was most damaging to all that northern territory. I commend the minister for establishing this experimental farm in Northern Ontario.

In view of all the circumstances, it is indeed ungrateful on the part of the hon. member for Moosejaw to sneer at the people of Ontario, forgetting the sacrifices made by them to develop the West. In past years the people of Ontario realized that we had a great heritage in our western country, which needed development and settlement, and to-day we do not complain that the Government is bearing the expense of these agricultural stations throughout the West. But the time has come when Ontario must look to herself to see that she also gets fair treatment. In the matter of immigration, for years past, Ontario has been discriminated against, and the flow of immigration has been diverted to the western provinces, with the result that by the Redistribution Bill, that wealthy province loses six of her representatives in this House. That may please some hon. gentlemen opposite, but to me it is evidence of the fact that in the future these western provinces must look to themselves and depend on their own resources, without seeking the aid of the other provinces to help them out of their

difficulties. We are told by an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House that the farmers of the West were not going to see these demonstration stations when they were driving their wheat to the market, thus implying that taking wheat to the market is the only thing that brings a western farmer from his home, which, of course, is an absurd view to take. In my opinion, the sooner demonstration farms are established throughout Canada, in order that our farmers may be taught to practise what is preached, the better it will be for the people of Canada. We have no mean province in Ontario; we have an energetic, an enterprising and an educated people, and they have learned to do for themselves what some of the people in the western provinces think the Government ought to do for them. The dairy products of Ontario last year represented a value of $125,000,000, the live stock of Ontario had a value of $510,000,000; the exports of Ontario last year were $186,000,000, and the imports of Ontario $290,000,000, the latter figures not including interprovincial trade. But that does not represent all the wealth developed by the people of Ontario.

So far as fruit growing is concerned, 80 per cent of the fruit of Canada is grown in the province of Ontario; yet there is not a fruit station nor an experimental station maintained in that province by the Dominion Government. Ninety-seven per cent of the grapes and peaches grown in Canada are grown in the province of Ontario; yet you find that, although stations are established in other provinces, such as British Columbia and the Maritime Provinces, the people of Ontario have to do all their experimental work for themselves. A number of experimental farms were established in 1911; but with the exception of a tobacco-growing farm of forty acres in the county of Essex, not one was established in the whole province of Ontario. This should not be a contentious matter; and I would not have made any reference to it, had it not been for the manner in which the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) referred to the people of the province of Ontario. The sooner the people of the western provinces depend upon their own resources and do not come to the Dominion Parliament looking for special favours, the better it will be for all concerned.

The hon. member referred to the necessity of supplying with wheat the farmers in a certain area who unfortunately lost their crops last year. In some of the older districts of Ontario where land is very valuable, if the people farmed in the manner in which the people farm in Western Canada, they would not grow very much. In my own county immense numbers of live stock are shipped from western Canada, and are fattened up and placed on the market. Food is brought in from western Canada and fed to live stock in the East; in fact, two dealers in foodstuffs for live stock, two feed stores at one shipping point in the county of Oxford during the present winter handled no less than nineteen carloads of cottonseed meal averaging about 22 tons to the car; and other feed in large quantities is being brought in. The Government of this country for many years past pursued one of the most reckless policies—yes, I will say a criminal policy—with regard to the importation of foodstuffs from western Canada. When a Government permits the screenings of grain from the elevators to be shipped out and distributed through some of the older provinces, such as the province of Ontario, it is doing something for which it ought to be held accountable. Hon. gentlemen here have stated that the western farmer who summer-fallows his land is practically assured of a crop. I remember in the old days in Ontario, when nearly every farmer summer-fallowed his land, but afterwards with a better system of farming he found that it was not necessary. To-day, however, he has to go back to the summer-fallowing system again by reason of the foul seeds that have been distributed over the province of Ontario and that came largely from western Canada. Later on in the Estimates the question will be brought up whether the Government of this country should see that all grain shipped to Government elevators is screened and that the screenings from that grain are destroyed and not distributed over the country.

I have taken longer than I intended in regard to this matter, but I want to emphasize the fact that Ontario is no mean province; that outside of the province of Quebec it is the largest province in Canada, and that not 15 per cent of its area is under cultivation. I commend the minister for his action in establishing an experimental farm in northern Ontario, and I believe he has adopted a splendid method in order to clear that by having interned prisoners do the work, because it will undoubtedly reflect great credit on

the northern country. Notwithstanding Professor Fernow's report, in which he stated that that country is not fit for settlement, geographically it is not located as far north as the city of Winnipeg, and it is to-day rich and fertile, although mostly covered with timber; and I am satisfied that the experimental station established there by the hon. Minister of Agriculture will do work that will call the attention of the people of this country to the advantages of location and the capability of the soil of northern Ontario to raise as good crops as are grown in other parts of Canada.

Mr. KNOWLES: I have no argument with my hon. friend in regard to the importance of the province of Ontario in many ways, and I think he has rather misunderstood my remarks. Surely the hon. gentleman does not wish to put me in an unfair light, because I did not make any remarks derogatory to the province of Ontario, as I think he ought to have known if he had been in the chamber at the time. I was advocating that we should have experimental farms to which the people would go in great numbers. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) stated, as I understood him, that men would not go to experimental farms, and I said that, if it be that the people of Ontario know so dashed much that they do not have to go, the people in the West are different: we do not think we are the whole shooting match; we do not think we know everything. True, we do not live in the delectable province of Ontario; but my hon. friend will have to account for having lived in such a godly place as Ontario, and inasmuch as the favours bestowed on him are so much greater, he will have to be so much more careful of the way he walks. My hon. friend has told us many times that Ontario is such a wonderful country, and he has scolded us because some weeds have gone from the West into that province. I do not want my hon. friend to run away with the idea that Ontario is altogether ready for the next world. I do not think we send our weeds to the East; I think large numbers of weeds came to us from Ontario at the start, because I cannot imagine any other places that they came from than Bruce and Huron and Oxford, where we got our seed from originally—and some very bad, devilish weeds they were too. My hon. friend should not say the West is under any favour to Ontario, because that is a played-out statement. We are not under any favours— far from it. True, the policy of the country at present is dictated largely by Ontario and the protectionist spirit. While Ontario has sent us some of its vile weeds, thank Heaven, it has not yet sent us its vile protectionist spirit. We have not the protectionist spirit brooding over us; we do not believe in it yet; but the protectionist spirit controls our politics and we are suffering. We are not, however, under any obligation to Ontario because we are under the heel of Ontario so far as the present Government is concerned. I say that to my hon. friend in all kindness.

My hon. friend speaks about the good land in Ontario. There is a great deal of good land in Ontario and it was here long before my hon. friend and I were born, and much of it was under cultivation; but my hon. friend should for a while take a whack at farming along the Canadian Pacific railway line between North Bay and Fort William and see how much Marquis wheat he can grow in that beautiful part of the province of Ontario. I am more pleased than I can tell my hon. friend to see that to-day, from his seat in the House—I will not say he has given the lie; I speak in all good humour, but he has repudiated the argument of his friends who said that the agricultural belt of the National Transcontinental was no good, because my hon. friend says it is a good country and is going to support a great population. We are pleased to have heard the truth from the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), that this district, through which the late Government built the National Transcontinental, is one of such fertile land that even the very good province of Ontario is proud to have it within its boundaries.

Mr. WRIGHT: I would like to take up the time of the committee for a few minutes in raising my voice in protest against this attempt once again to set the East against the West and the West against the East. It seems to me that the farmers of the Dominion of Canada do not require to be put in hostile camps of that kind, nor will their best interests be served in that way. The West has its own peculiar problems and difficulties, and these have been looked upon with a great deal of consideration by the representatives from other parts of the country. Everything has been done that we could reasonably do—those of us who represent the East—to change conditions in favour of the farmer of the West. I trust that the best representatives from the West

look upon the farmers of the East with the same measure of consideration. Our problems are one, after all. Now, we have some difficulties in the East. I would ask the minister to take into consideration the interests of that large tract of the province of Ontario lying between the agricultural and fruit-growing portion of Ontario to the south and the great clay belt to the north. There is there a great stretch of country not quite so favourable for agricultural production, but admirably adapted for a great many things. Our people in the section of country from which I come do not know exactly what can be produced in that country, and we would like very much to see an experimental farm established there. The country of which I speak takes in such districts as Muskoka, Parry Sound, Nipissing and Haliburton and other constituencies further to the east whose conditions are somewhat similar. We believe there are a great many kinds of fruit that can be grown in that country. We believe it is admirably adapted for the production of a great many kinds of vegetables and roots. True, we produce great numbers of cattle and also no inconsiderable quantity of grain and vegetables. But we are not working under the best conditions. With a view to demonstrating the possibilities of that country, our people have approached the local Government at Toronto and pressed their claim time after time. But we have been met of late with the reply that the lack of funds has made it impossible for the local Government to take part in carrying out our wishes. So, I bring the subject before the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion and ask his assistance so that we may have some kind of demonstration farm established in that country to show our farmers there what our particular part of this great Dominion is capable of producing. We have been able to come down to the city of Ottawa for two or three years and, at your great annual exhibition, carry off first prize with our display of potatoes. We have been able to do the same in the city of Toronto for eight or ten years handrunning. Our people were able to go to the town of Brockville and take some of the prizes in grain last winter. But our farmers are not educated in a general way to take advantage of the peculiar qualities of our soil. These cases that I mention are the result of individual effort. There is no general effort to demonstrate to our farmers the benefit of certain kinds of cultivation and to show them for what line of production our conditions are best suited. Therefore I ask the Minister of Agriculture to give to our section of the country the consideration to which we think it is entitled.

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) asked me what land had been bought in connection with the Rosthern farm. A strip of land lying between the station and the right of way of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamboat Company, containing approximately 15 acres, was bought at the price of $1,000. Another plot of 440 acres was bought from Jacob Janzen. It forms the NE. ¼ and S. ½ of section 26, tp. 42, range 3, west of the 3rd meridian.

I desire to say just a word in answer to the remarks of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) and the remarks of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. Wright). As to these farms and the work of the Agricultural Department generally, I hope that hon. members understand that there is no East and no West in what we are doing. I happen to be a western man myself, my home being much farther west than that of my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) or other hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken. I was also an Ontario man. I think that everybody in this House will agree that what is done for agriculture should be done, so far as possible, equitably throughout the country. It is true, we are making this initial step in demonstration work in southern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta. But that does not mean that northern Alberta, northern Saskatchewan, Ontario and other parts will be left out, as the work develops and the opportunities warrant. I shall be glad to keep in mind what my hon. friends have said.

M. H. ACHIM (Labelle) (Translation): Mr Chairman, it was not my intention to take much of the time of the minister to air my views on this question, but the prolonged debate on this subject participated in by my hon. friends from the west and from Ontario does away with any hesitation I may have had. In view of that lengthy discussion, I cannot be accused of loquacity if I devote two or three minutes to the province of Quebec. It is not out of place to recall in this House, as elsewhere, that there still exists such a province, which has played an historic and important part in this country.

From the viewpoint of agriculture, it needs envy very little either of the western provinces or the province of Ontario. The complaints that I bring to the minister from my constituency are very much similar to those laid before him by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles). In his reply, the Minister of Agriculture freed me from certain misgivings which have been worrying me for the last two or three years. When I became a member of this House, I received numerous petitions from the district of Labelle, requesting from the Government the establishment of an experimental farm or rather of an agricultural station in that part of the province of Quebec. Heretofore, and more especially during the last few years, new districts such as the Abbitibi, the Temiskaming and New Ontario have engrossed public attention; but it has been too readily forgotten that for some fifty years past the region of Labelle has been opened to settlers by a distinguished and zealous priest, Mgr. Labelle, whom the federal and the provincial governments encouraged in his task and that the new district has helped to alleviate the congestion of some of our cities. And the fact must be kept in mind that in the district of Labelle the soil is not as fertile as in the valleys of the St. Lawrence and of the Ottawa. The settlers of Labelle have migrated for the most part from the valleys of those two rivers and are of course prone to apply the same methods of cultivation with which they had become familiar in those places where the rich clay is very different from the soil of the northern regions. Moreover I must add that many of the settlers had never been on a farm; most of them are workmen who have been snatched away by this enthusiastic apostle from the dangers of cities and under his guidance have pitched their tents in that region and set themselves to the task of bringing up their children. To-day the influx of settlers has slackened and I must be within the truth when I say that colonization is best brought about by the family. When a father has settled upon a lot and has thrived, he seeks to settle his numerous children around him. Up to the present time, the almost exclusive means of livelihood in those parts was the lumber trade. The forest was the principal source of revenue. Now, unfortunately, lumber is beginning to get scarce; the land is clear and the settler must resort to its cultivation to find his living and the sustenance of his family.

The soil with the exception of a few more fertile localities, is generally poor, and requires for its cultivation appropriate methods. We have here at Ottawa, it is true, an experimental farm with a splendid equipment, but the settlers cannot be expected to take frequent trips of two or three hundred miles to Ottawa at a cost of twenty-five to thirty dollars each for the purpose of obtaining information on the best agricultural methods. My idea is that the settler should not have to come to the experimental farm, but the farm should go to the settler. In this connection, I take pleasure in congratulating the Minister of Agriculture upon his scheme by which those new farms will be made centres of distribution; over those centres, the Ottawa experimental farm will spread its sheltering branches as far as my constituency, to which it would certainly be beneficial.

As regards the measure under consideration, I fully agree with the minister. I heard him state in the course of his reply to the hon. member for Moosejaw that he intended to set up some twenty stations of that type in the West. Without the least thought of harming the West, I may, on behalf of my electors, ask the minister if he could not reduce to nineteen the number of western stations and give my county the twentieth. Those districts where a fertile soil yields hay, oats and other grain a-plenty are not those whose farmers have most need of scientific model farms. But in our country, where the soil being lighter is of course less fertile, and where climatic disturbances are more frequent and dangerous, I venture to say that agricultural stations are a necessity, because there the land is not made to produce as much as it could, that is, proportionately to the area under cultivation, it should yield one-third more than its present production. The farmers are not acquainted with the scientific methods of cultivation which are best adapted to the nature of the soil and its geological formation.

I may be allowed to express my thanks to the minister for inaugurating such a progressive system that will solve a problem of great importance and for a long time agitated. I hope he will not forget the settlers of the district of Labelle and that he will do as much for them as for the farmers of Ontario and of the Great West.

Mr. J. GIRARD (Chicoutimi and Saguenay) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the condition of my throat does not allow me to make a lengthy speech, but I deem it my duty to express my views in a few words

I listened with keen interest to the remarks that have been made on this most important topic, agriculture, and my congratulations are due the hon. members from western constituencies for the convincing arguments they have brought to support their contentions. It was also a pleasure to hear the explanations given by the minister during the debate; his efficient work is praiseworthy and his initiative in the furtherance of agricultural interests commendable. The item now before us relates to experimental farms. I can see that the subject absorbs the attention of all members, but especially of those from the western prairies, and also that in the more northern districts, the farmers, through their representatives, attach much importance to this question, which, in fact, is for us of the most vital consequence. I realize that in the particular circumstances in which Canada is placed, the minister cannot easily satisfy the demands made upon him from all parts of the country. To get over the present difficulty it has been suggested that demonstration farms or stations be established on a much smaller scale than the branches of the experimental farm. Doubtless the scheme is practical and under the circumstances will be very beneficial. But the minister's solicitude must not extend exclusively to the western provinces. Every session for the last few years, the Canadian Parliament has been called upon to provide aid for the settlers of the new provinces. This year we are asked to vote the large sum of ten millions to provide seed for those farmers who have settled on the Government lands. That grant is not a gift but will have to be repaid by all those who have been helped. The Dominion Government had to take such a course because, at the time the new provinces were erected, it kept to itself the control of the public lands; but in view of the obligations which that reservation entails, had we not better amend the law and put those provinces on the same footing as the older provinces, transfer to them the full control of their own lands and let them shift for themselves. Does it not seem anomalous that next spring the farmers of the province of Quebec as well as those from the eastern provinces, will have, as they have been doing, every year, to purchase large quantities of seed grain from the west itself. Is it not an oddity that we easterners are buying our seed from the west while at the same time we are asked to advance millions of dollars to the very people who supply us with what we want. On account of the nefarious war which shakes all Europe and even the whole world, Canada is placed in a peculiar position; its evident duty and interest lie in increasing to its limits its agricultural production, so as to enable Europe, by supplying it with the necessaries of life, to stave off starvation. With this in view, the Minister of Agriculture has organized throughout the country a series of patriotic lectures, as they are called, having for their object to awaken the farmers to the necessities that have arisen and still more to those that will arise in the future; and also to point out to the farming community that now is the time to go to work and take the necessary steps to meet the needs I have just mentioned by an unprecedented excess of production. There has been generally a happy selection of lecturers. The farmers attended the meetings in large numbers and listened with deep interest to the important discussions carried on. The scheme is a patriotic one and its beginning as a means of theoretical education bodes well for its success; but as was pointed out in to-day's debate, it must necessarily be supplemented by object lessons, by an increase in the number of experimental farms and by the establishment of agricultural stations. I desire at this juncture to warn the minister that it is of the utmost importance that these lectures on agriculture should be kept free from all party politics. At one of the meetings which have been successfully carried out by Hon. Mr. Burrell in the province of Quebec, after two officers of his department, Messrs. Fortier and Gingras had delivered their lectures, which they always manage to render practical, a man by the name of Gareau, lecturer for the Quebec Government got up to speak. In an outburst of vituperation, he warned the audience against the movement organized by the Dominion Department of Agriculture to awaken the farmer to the necessity of improving his stock, and against their taking advantage of the offer of the department, who lends choice bulls to those farmers who wish to improve their methods and who apply to the minister at Ottawa. This man Gareau went so for as to denounce the Minister of Agriculture as the agent of certain cattle-breeders of Ontario and of the eastern townships, who desire to get rid of old worn-out animals. How can practical results be secured when such partisan wrangling is carried on before the farmers who have attended the lectures in good faith and are put at a loss to know what to do when the Minister of Agriculture

hands over to the Quebec Government a special subsidy of $190,000 a year as a help to agriculture in that province, it seems to me that the only proper thing to do for the Provincial Government is to employ none but men of judgment and discretion, and not mere election agents, who, disregarding all propriety, and callous to the public interest, drag the Dominion Minister in the mire for no purpose but to disparage the good work he is doing.

In past years, I spoke in this House of the question now before the House in so far as my constituency was concerned. I am aware that in this forum, our own separate local interests must not monopolize our attention, but the interest of every locality must be considered as those of the one great Canadian family. But if I revert to the discussion that has taken place here to-day, the most serious complaints and the most forcible arguments that have been heard have come from the representatives of the most northern districts. It has been shown how, even in the West there is found, with a difference in latitude, great differences in geological formations and climatic influences, that create, in the more northern regions, even on the best farms, special difficulties of cultivation. If on the western plains, which are so fertile, the higher latitudes present special problems to the agriculturist, the same endures in the eastern provinces. In the East, there are localities favoured with mild winters; others where it is colder and others still are found, as my county, where a severe winter lasts for six or seven months and where climatic conditions differ radically from those of the province of Quebec, because the atmospheric currents are different and so the chances of successful cultivation are lessened. The soil is fertile, the farmers live comfortably, and from the railway records we see that the agricultural population, which numbers 30,000 in the districts of Chicoutimi and Lake St. John, has secured from the cheese and live stock industries more than two million dollars of revenue. But such a revenue can be obtained under such special circumstances only by harder labour, and a better grasp of the underlying principles of good farming than what is required in other more favoured sections of the province, on account of the more strenuous efforts exacted from the tiller of the soil by a less bountiful Providence, so to speak, and the continued climatic disturbances.

To the north and south of the Laurentians, the Dominion Government has established branches of the experimental farm at Compton, in the eastern townships, at Cap Rouge and at Sainte Anne de la Pocatière. Moreover, a philanthrophic Canadian millionaire has erected in the vicinity at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, the famous Macdonald agricultural college, which is after all an experimental farm, perhaps the best equipped in this country. We also have in that part of the province agricultural schools at Oka and at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, which are in their way experimental farms on a smaller scale. Here then in the province of Quebec we find six very important practical institutions, of which two, under the control of the Dominion authorities, are situated in the same district and subject to absolutely the same climate.

Excursions of farmers to the experimental farms have been suggested. Of course, such trips have a certain educative value, but others have stated here before me that they cannot be of much help especially when the visitors come from a region subject to a different climate and having a different geological formation. I have myself at different times organized similar excursions to the central experimental farm at Ottawa. Coming from such a distance, the excursionists found little time to appreciate the methods used and so different were the nature of the soil and the climatic conditions, that, after their return home, they found they had brought back very little that could avail them on their farms.

We now hear on a sudden of a great agricultural movement along the Transcontinental railway, around Lake Abitibi, a new region about whose geology and climate nothing is known. Why such a leap in the dark, and why overlook the province of Quebec, especially those localities where settlement has already been shown to be possible, where agriculture can be carried on with success and where there are still left, as in the Matapedia valley, especially in my constituency, lands of great fertility, on which numerous parishes could be established, but wherein farmers hesitate to settle through fear of unfavourable geographical conditions. It seems to me more rational to take all possible means to maintain and increase a country's population in well known districts rather than let those regions shift for themselves and confine our efforts to those localities in which success is quite uncertain. That policy explains why I take it to be my duty to state anew in this House the needs of my electors, and to

insist on the minister and the Government doing immediately what is fair by us.

During the last few years, I have maintained with the department an active correspondence on this subject. I have forwarded numerous petitions, and our position has been put before the minister in a clear light. The answers were never unfavourable, but a definite asquiescence is yet to come. Other places more favourably located have received attention while the department, without any ill-will, I know, has been neglecting that part of the province wherein the first experimental farm ought to have been established. The minister, I hope, accepts my remarks in the same spirit in which I make them. I advocate now the claims of justice and common sense, and of course common sense, as ever, is bound to triumph, and the long expected answer will come in due course.

On behalf of my electors, I must express publicly to the Minister of Agriculture our appreciation of all he has been doing to promote the welfare of the farming community of which I am a representative. He also deserves the thanks of that community for the practical assistance given to the improvement of cattle, especially of milch cows. The farmers greatly appreciate the help he has given them, and I deem it my duty to tell him so in this House.

As regards the educational work to be continued, I believe that the minister would do well to take advantage of the rights which accrue to him from the federal subsidies to the different provinces to be devoted to the promotion of agriculture, and introduce in this country the system followed in Germany, France, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, where experimental stations, agricultural colleges and lyceums have been established in large numbers in every section of their respective territories. To put the final touch to the education of farmers' sons and daughters, the Government, at its own expense sends them to visit the best colleges and the most practical farms, so that, by this comparative study, they may become better farmers and develop a greater love for the calling of their parents. That course will, better than all else, help to make agriculture more congenial to them and to keep on the soil the children who would forsake it for the cities.

We are now in the throes of a financial crisis; everybody must make sacrifices; economy is the watch-word. But an expenditure which cannot be cut down or delayed, is that which aims at stirring up the farmers' apathy, awakening them to the needs and obligations of their profession, and making agriculture as prosperous as lies in the power of a Government. If there is on the surface of the earth an industry which more than another has not remained stationary, it is assuredly agriculture, so, whatever may be the actual stress, I respectfully submit that the Government cannot devote too much of our revenue to its upbuilding and prosperity, and it is the duty of public men who understand the true interests of the country to help the efforts of the Government in that direction.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, it was a pleasure for me to be able to listen from the beginning to this debate participated in by both English and French speakers, and I must say that I fully concur in the remarks which have been made by the hon. members for Labelle (Mr. Achim) and for Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard): I submit that the climatic conditions which prevail in the county of Rimouski and the eastern portion of the province of Quebec, call for greater assistance from the Government than the old part of Ontario and even the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which all enjoy the benefit of a most favourable climate. The farmers of the eastern districts of the province of Quebec have to cope with inclement weather conditions. Seeding cannot take place before the month of June; and very often early frosts blast the hopes of an abundant harvest; to that the inhabitants of those regions, with a winter season lasting generally all of seven months, show greater courage and endurance that the farmers of Ontario and the other provinces in which winter lasts but three or four months. Those districts especially have a right to look to the paternal solicitude of the Government. In Ontario, fruits grow abundantly and grain ripens easily. Once the land is sowed; the farmer has only to wait for the crops to ripen; he has no fears of frost.

The representatives of the western provinces are anxious for the Government help that will enable them to purchase seed grain. They are indeed fortunate in having secured a law which favours them to the exclusion of certain other parts of this country who need such assistance a good deal more than they. I fail to see, as also the hon. member for Chicoutimi, why we grant millions to the farmers of the west to help them in procuring seed grain, when,

in the eastern part of Quebec, where I have my residence, we often have to purchase our own seed grain from the western farmers. It seems to me that those farmers could bear certain inconveniences and obtain their seed from their neighbours without continually appealing for assistance from the Government.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure) : Will the hon. member allow me to call his attention to the fact that, after asking this explanation from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche), I was made to understand that the seed thus furnished to the western farmer is not given but sold to him, and as security the Government takes a lien on his harvest. It is a mere loan.

Mr. BOULAY: I am thankful for the information, but I can say that the farmers of the province of Quebec would be glad to enjoy the same privilege. If the same course were followed for such districts as Temiscouata, Bonaventure, Chicoutimi, and Gaspé, which often find themselves in distress, I believe that the farmers would be glad to take advantage of such loans, because quite often at spring-time, they have not the money to buy their seed grain and they could easily in the fall repay out of their harvest the money that would have been advanced to them by the Government.

I have already pleaded for an experimental farm in the county of Rimouski. There is one already in the county of Kamouraska, et Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, but on account of the distance, our farmers cannot easily visit it. The Gaspé peninsula, comprising the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure, is so to speak, a small province in itself, and there especially the farmers require to be helped along. If an experimental farm cannot be established in the county of Matane, for instance, the least that could be done would be the establishment of agricultural stations, which would be of great usefulness to the farmers. If an experimental farm were erected in the Matapedia valley, where the land is of the best to be found in that country for farming, it would render great services to Bonaventure and Rimouski, where good results could be expected at an early date. I entertain the fervent hope that the Minister of Agriculture will not henceforth overlook those districts which have a greater call on his attention than other parts of the country. Our farmers show such courage and struggle so bravely against an adverse climate that they should be given more encouragement than elsewhere. We would think ourselves fortunate if we lived in a country like the province of Ontario or even the western part of Quebec or New Brunswick, where the climate is a great deal milder than ours, but there we are and there we must stay, and the Government is in duty bound to extend to us its solicitude.

Now I may be allowed a slight criticism of the staff of the Department of Agriculture. I find that in that department, especially among the higher officers it is impossible for a French-speaking person who does not speak English to make himself understood. Those higher officers who are frequently in communication with the farmers of Quebec, ought to understand French. We go to their offices, and no matter how important the information we desire, it cannot be given us. These officers, moreover, go into the English speaking sections of the country and deliver lectures for the benefit of the English-speaking farmers, while the province of Quebec, whose population does not speak English cannot derive any advantage from such visits, because those officers do not speak French. I claim that all higher officers should speak French so as to be able to meet every elector and every farmer of Canada. For the most part, they are competent men and qualified for their position. It would be a great advantage for the province of Quebec to meet them and hear them expound the best agricultural methods; but we are deprived of that opportunity. When we call at the department, we have to pick up an interpreter among the young clerks or stenographers. I myself speak English with a certain fluency, but when I have to discuss technical questions I cannot express myself with as much freedom in English as I do in French. The other day I ventured into a room where nine employees were at work and not one of them could understand me. This state of things is the same in all the departments and the Department of Agriculture is not an exception. The staff of the Department of Agriculture, according to the Civil Service List of 1913, comprises 31 French Canadians and 237 English-speaking employees. It seems to me that such a condition is unfair and that there should be a larger number of French Canadians, more in keeping with the importance of the French-speaking population of this country.

Hon. Mr. BURRELL (Translation): I appreciate the remarks made by my hon. friends from the province of Quebec and I

take note of them. The requirements of the province of Quebec will be dealt with in the same spirit as those of the other provinces.

I understood my hon. friend to say that a great many of the officials of the department are unable to speak the French language. I may say that the director of the experimental farm speaks French fluently, and a great many of our other officers are familiar with the French language.

Mr. ROCHON (Translation): As I rise for the first time to address this House, I take a great deal of pleasure in seconding the remarks made by the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard) in his denunciation of those officers of the provincial government who take advantage of their position to throw discredit on the officers of the Dominion Government.

I also agree with what was said by the member for Labelle (Mr. Achim), in his plea for equal justice for the beautiful district, through which flow the rivers Gatineau, La Rouge, and Du Nord, a land which some years ago the late Father Labelle opened in the north and, with prophetic insight pointed out to the settler.

Arts and Agriculture—for the administration and enforcement of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act, $100,000.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I wish to direct the attention of the minister to the regulations regarding the shipment of potatoes from areas affected with powdery scab to foreign countries. In the case of Prince Edward Island, these shipments would be made to the islands of Newfoundland, St. Pierre and Miquelon. The regulations affecting the shipments of potatoes under these conditions are such that, if enforced, we could not ship at all. Shipments made from our province are made very largely by water, and it would be quite impossible to comply with the regulations as I find them in the Royal Gazette. I understand that the department permits shipments to be made without regard to these regulations, and I should like to have it definitely understood whether or not that is the case.

Mr. BURRELL: Regulation B, section 2, which has regard to shipments from infected areas, is in accord with the Destructive Insects and Pest Act. Our regulations say that within the infected area you can move the products concerned virtually without inspection, but when you come to ship to another province which is not infected, you would have to have an inspection.

[Mr. Burrell.]

There is nothing to stop you from shipping your potatoes to Newfoundland except any objection which might be made by those to whom you ship. We do not have any inspection of shipments of potatoes going to Newfoundland; if the Newfoundland people say to you that your potatoes are infected, the onus is on you.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: There is a good deal of doubt as to whether the potatoes in our province are really affected by powdery scab. When the potatoes are loaded into the ship the shipper has no means of knowing whether they are affected with powdery scab or not, and if some fussy official comes along who, perhaps, does not know a great deal about powdery scab, he can give the shipper a great deal of inconvenience under the present regulations. It is to provide against a condition of that kind that I should like to have the matters cleared up.

Mr. BURRELL: None of our inspectors are concerned with shipments to a foreign country; they would be concerned only with shipments to other provinces of Canada which are free from powdery scab. I quite admit that in all these things there is a good deal of inconvenience to potato growers, and I can only assure my hon. friend that the feeling which I have always held very strongly is that it is unfortunate that the United States should have taken the drastic action which they did take in this matter. The action that we have taken in this country has been entirely owing to the stand taken by the United States authorities. I have always firmly believed that this disease is not anything like as injurious in its nature as potato canker, and perhaps not more serious than the ordinary scab. However, we were face to face with an embargo upon our potatoes on the part of the United States, and, in order to accede to the request of the shippers to give them as good a market as we could, these regulations were made. The people of the eastern provinces thought that it was better that these regulations should be put into effect and that they should get some kind of a market than that they should have no market at all in the United States. A short while ago a shipment of potatoes was refused at Boston on the ground that they were infected with powdery scab, and the embargo was replaced on the whole country. I am informed by my inspectors, however, that the officials, after searching for seven hours, found but two

potatoes which were infected with powdery scab. I cannot speak with authority, but I am inclined to think that the United States authorities will gradually come to the conclusion that this disease is not as serious as they at first thought it was, and that the whole embargo will be wiped out. It has done good, however, in calling the attention of the potato growers of the country to the necessity for wiping out any serious disease of potatoes. I can only tell my hon. friend that so far as we are concerned we are simply making these regulations to try and give shippers a market under the best possible conditions.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I am quite pleased to have the assurance of the minister that there will be no trouble so far as shipments from our province are concerned. I agree, too, that the United States was not justified in putting into force such drastic regulations. I think that we ourselves were somewhat to blame, because in the autumn of 1913 we sent a man to Washington who told the American authorities that our potatoes were diseased. We could hardly expect them to take any other course than to take us at our word, and so they imposed very stringent regulations against the exportation of our potatoes.

Mr. BURRELL: I know that my hon. friend would not wish to be misleading. We could not deny that we had powdery scab; and as for our officer saying that we had it, he was only stating what they already knew. They had their men in the country, and they knew absolutely, as we knew absolutely, that we had powdery scab. I do not personally attach the importance to the disease that some people do; but you cannot conceal the fact that the disease is in the country. We have it to-day, but I do not believe that it is of the serious nature that many people believe.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: In my province there is no doubt about that.

Mr. BURRELL: We have not any doubt; we know.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Some few years ago two officials of the department from Ottawa visited our province and visited the premises of one particular man who was a representative potato grower. They informed this man that he had powdery scab, and told him he must not on any account use his potatoes for seed purposes, that he must get potatoes from some other person where he would be sure that they would be free from disease. This particular person attached no importance to the instruction, and went on using his potatoes for seed purposes. He had two crops, and this autumn two other officials came along, visited his farm, and gave him a clean bill of health as having no powdery scab on his place, while some other farmers had it. A thing of that kind becomes well known in the surrounding neighbourhood, and it leaves everybody in doubt. I think the first officials must have been mistaken. The scab they saw must have been the old scab that was not at all dangerous.

Last autumn two gentlemen came to the province to lecture on this subject, Mr. Adams and Mr. Holmden. Mr. Adams, who was supposed to know a good deal about this disease, came from Ireland, where they have it very extensively. He lectured on the causes of the disease and the method of propagation. He told us that a moist climate was favourable to its production, and also a soil in which lime naturally occurred. In the province of Prince Edward Island we have a moist climate; that would be against us; but our soil contains no lime. The other gentleman followed him the same night, and lectured on the prevention of the disease. He advised the farmers to spray their cellars or potato warehouses with a solution of formaldehyde or, in the absence of that, with a preparation of lime, which would kill the spores. We asked him to tell us why lime in the soil would propagate the spores and in the cellar would kill them—and we did not get an answer. I presume there is an answer. These are the things that lead farmers to believe that these men do not know much about their subjects, after all. It would be better for the men sent out in that way to be thoroughly posted on their subjects before going to lecture people, because questions are sure to be asked. For my own information and for the information of others, I would be glad to know how lime in the soil will propagate that disease and lime in the cellar will cure it.

Mr. BURRELL: I could not attempt to answer all the expert or technical questions my hon. friend puts. I may say, however, that occasionally a good dose of whisky will save a man's life and perhaps if you give a dose of whisky to the next fellow it will kill him. It depends on the condition of the man.

Mr. GRAHAM: And something on the quality of the whisky, too.

Mr. BURRELL: Yes. I think that what my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) has said does not contradict anything I have advanced, and I hope that conditions will become more favourable very soon.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I notice that some of the members of the House are very anxious to have lecturers sent into their respective districts to instruct the farmers in the best methods of farming. I do not ask the minister to send any lecturers into our district. Our experience is that these gentlemen do not know much about farming. They may have spent a year or two perhaps in college and learned the names of vegetables and plants, but beyond that our experience is that those who come to our province know very little about practical farming. The consequence is that the farmers do not, in any number, go to hear them. The minister can save that expenditure so far as our province is concerned. Some few years ago a lecturer came to our province who advocated deep ploughing. He told the farmers that they had a second farm under the one they were using and that they could obtain access to it by deep ploughing and thus get virgin soil and much better crops. A year or two after that another man came along and condemned that absolutely. He opposed deep ploughing or much ploughing of any kind. He advocated surface cultivation.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE: What do you think about it?

Mr. HUGHES: I am addressing my remarks to the chairman and the minister, who know what I am talking about. Another lecturer came to our province, I think last year, and a number of farmers went to listen to him. One man asked him what he would do to bring in a worn-out field, or worn-out land, and the prompt answer was: Sow clover on it. The minister knows well enough that that was no answer to give to a practical farmer, that the land would have to be well cultivated and in good condition before you could get a catch of clover. You might as well sow the clover on the sea shore as on a worn-out field. Consequently practical farmers go away from meetings of that kind and doubt everything they have heard. I would therefore ask the minister to send a better class of men to our province, if he has any at all, and if he has not any of a better class, not to send any, and save that much expense. These are practical questions, and upon them I am sure the minister will agree with me.

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister given up all hope of having the embargo on our potatoes removed? This matter came up when the minister was away. The Minister of Customs stated in the House that the shipment came from New Brunswick, but the hon. member from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), who took part in the debate, was most positive that there was no powdery scab in that shipment at all; and what the minister now says confirms that statement. Have the American authorities extended that embargo to the whole of Canada?

Mr. BURRELL: Apparently they have, and apparently they are within their rights, because they explicitly stated that if any powdery scab was found they would restore the embargo. They find powdery scab undoubtedly, although in exceedingly small quantities, and after a great deal of trouble. I do not say that there is no hope of getting that embargo removed. On the contrary I am inclined to believe that in the course of not a very long time the attitude of the United States authorities, especially of the technical officers, will be entirely changed, and that they will come to the conclusion that the situation does not warrant such drastic action.

For the development of the dairying industries, and the improvement in transportation, sale and trade in food and other agricultural products, $150,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the minister going to give the same facilities as last year for the transportation of butter from eastern Quebec to the Montreal market? Quite a number of butter factories have been started on the Gaspè peninsula, and the people there are much interested in this question.

Mr. BURRELL: We expect to give the same facilities.

Mr. TOBIN: I would like to call the attention of the minister to a letter that I received from the president of the Eastern Townships Associated Boards of Trade. The letter, which encloses a resolution, is as follows:

Sherbrooke, Que., April 1, 1915.

E. W. Tobin, Esq., M.P.,
House of Parliament,
Ottawa, Ont..

Dear Sir:

We have the honour to transmit herewith copy of resolution adopted at the recent annual meeting of the Eastern Townships Associated Boards of Trade.

We may say that delegates from the various Farmers' Clubs joined with the Associated

Boards at that meeting and were most emphatic in their expressions with regard to the serious condition which has been created through the increased prices of feed. It was pointed out that unless something was done to prevent the inflation of prices by speculators the consequences would be disastrous in the matter of agricultural production, and that the output of many of our farms would be lessened.

Yours very truly,
Eastern Townships Associated Boards of Trade,
V. E. Morrill,
President.

Has the minister received a copy of that letter?

Mr. BURRELL: I am afraid I cannot give my hon. friend any information about that, as I only got back a few days ago and have not yet had time to look over my correspondence.

Mr. TOBIN: I will read the resolution which the letter encloses:

Extract from minutes of annual meeting of the Eastern Townships Associated Boards of Trade, held at Sherbooke, March 16, 1915:

It was moved by J. A. Watson, seconded by Geo. W. A. Reburn, and resolved:

That whereas the Eastern Townships Associated Boards of Trade have learned from the delegates to this meeting from Farmers' Clubs that the production of our farmers cannot well be increased until the price of feed for our cattle and food for our population be reduced to within a measureable distance of where these prices were before the outbreak of hostilities;

Whereas the milling companies are obliging dealers in the Eastern Townships to accept, in each shipment of feed, many bags of flour which they do not actually require, at the excessive, increased prevailing price, which is unreasonable when the present price of wheat is considered, thus loading ordinary dealers with high-priced flour;

Whereas it is evident that the present price of grain is not increased sufficiently to warrant the excessive and increased price now charged for flour, bran, shorts, etc., by the milling companies of the Dominion;

Whereas this is certainly done in restraint of trade;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that these Eastern Townships Associated Boards of Trade protest against such increased price of food stuffs, in so far as this increase is not absolutely justifiable;

That this protest be rendered effective by forwarding copy of this resolution to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to the Minister of Agriculture, and to the members of Parliament representing the Eastern Townships at Ottawa, with a request that it be handed for action to the commission which has already been appointed to investigate the high cost of living.

And furthermore that these Eastern Townships Associated Boards of Trade severely deprecate the idea of any persons or companies using present war conditions to enrich themselves.

Certified true copy.

W. M. Hillhouse,
Acting Secretary.

I hope the minister will take this matter into his consideration, and lay the letter and resolution before the High Cost of Living Commission.

Mr. BURRELL: The deputy informs me that he thinks the letter was received and transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce, with which it had more to do. It would probably be placed before the High Cost of Living Commission, whose report I am informed is in the hands of the printer.

Mr. GRAHAM: This item covers a multitude of things. What does the minister propose to do for the development of the dairying industry?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, it covers quite a lot of items. We propose to carry on the activities we have been engaged in for the last two or three years. One very important item is the carrying on of the work of the record centres. Speaking from memory, I think we have thirty-two centres at the present time; quite a large number of them are in Ontario. The animals tested in each centre run from 700 to 1,000. At the end of the year the farmers associated with the centre are able to see how profitable their animals are, what is the percentage of butter fat and so on, and whether or not the animals are paying their board bill. It is a very valuable work. Then there other items such as the model cheese factory, model creamery, refrigerator car service and cold storage for fruit. It is practically the same work as was carried on last year, there being very little increase this year on any of the lines I have mentioned.

Mr. GRAHAM: How does the quality of our cheese compare with that of other years, and with that of other countries? Are we maintaining our high reputation?

Mr. BURRELL: My impression is that we are. As my hon. friend can understand, I have not had any late word about it, as I have not had time to see any of the officials. I shall be very glad to get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. GRAHAM: How do our butter exports compare this year with last? Are we consuming all our butter? Are we making as much?

Mr. BURRELL: There was none exported last year, and I imagine it will be the same this year. I think we are making as much. I shall be very glad to take a note of what my hon. friend says and hand it to the dairy commissioner.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps one of the officials could hand me the information, for members are often asked these questions, even when going along on the train. Some of us who are interested in agricultural societies give special prizes to encourage the raising of various kinds of stock, milch cows, for instance, and dairy herds. Has the department any suggestion to make as to the best use that can be made of these prize distributions? For instance, I know of one member that gives two prizes for the best dairy herd. The idea in giving a prize is to stimulate competition between the ordinary farmers as well as between the producers of the very finest stock, but we find that the same people get the prizes every year, no matter how you change it around, and they are, of course, entitled to them because they exhibit the best herds. Is there any suggestion by which a prize can be given that would be a stimulus outside of those who produce pure-breds?

Mr. BURRELL: The only thing you could do would be to offer prizes to those who never got a prize before.

Mr. GRAHAM: I thought of that, but I had reference more to what we would exclude in a prize of that kind.

Mr. BURRELL: It is a pretty wide subject and I would be very glad to get suggestions with reference to it.

Mr. MARCIL: Dairying is becoming an important industry in my constituency, and I would like to know from the minister if he has had an application from Bonaventure for one of these cow-testing machines?

Mr. BURRELL: What we usually do is to try to find some district where the dairying industry is not quite up to the mark, where there are a sufficient number of cows, and where the people are anxious to bring their dairying up to the highest standard. We have now thirty or forty of these stations, and this year I do not think we can do any more than carry them on, although we hope to extend the work later. For the last year or two we have been reaching out to all districts possible, including many in Quebec, and in Ontario, and in the West. It does not follow that because there is an application for a dairy-record district that we establish one, because it means a great deal of expense and we have to cut our coat according to our cloth. A great many applications have come in with which we have not been able to deal.

[Mr. Burrell.]

Mr. MARCIL: The farmers in a county like that which I represent have a great many hardships to encounter which are not the lot of other farmers in Canada. The summer lasts for five months and the farmer has seven months of winter to face. In Bonaventure, ten or twelve butter factories have sprung up in recent years, and some are coming into existence in Gaspé county. The farmers are far removed from the markets; they have to depend on an out-of-date railway, the climatic conditions are severe in that part of the country, and the people are most certainly deserving of help from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BURRELL: I will bear that in mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I have before me a number of pamphlets issued by the Department of Agriculture, dealing with the dairying industry, cold storage, cow tests, ice on the farm, butter-making on the farm, and so on, and all these pamphlets contain most valuable information for the farmer. I find on inquiry at the department that the supply of this literature is very limited and that the system of distribution is, to my mind, inadequate. The members representing rural constituencies would, I believe, value most highly a generous supply of literature of this description. We do get a certain number of copies of the evidence taken before the Agricultural Committee of this House, but to my mind it is of little value from the educational point of view and only useful as an attestation of the fact that certain members attended that committee. I should like to have 400 or 500 copies of each of the publications I have referred to for distribution throughout my constituency, but I have been informed by the department that some of them are out of print, and that the supply is not equal to the demand. Does not the minister think it would be in the interests of agriculture and of the country generally to spend a little more money in distributing a liberal supply of this literature, and possibly to economize on the printing and distribution of certain blue books which are worthless?

Mr. McCRANEY: I endorse the suggestion of my hon. friend that money spent by the Government in the publication and distribution of such pamphlets as he has mentioned would be far better spent than on a number of publications which are of no use whatever. Many of the blue books I receive go to the waste-paper basket; I

do not want to read them, and I have no place to put them, and the two copies of each being sent simply doubles the nuisance. The British Government print and distribute certain publications, such as the correspondence in connection with the war, which are issued at a mere nominal fee, and that is not a bad idea. For example, the white papers of the French Government, which is quite a large volume, has been issued at the price of one penny. The members of this House receive a bound edition of the sessional papers. Since I have been a member I have sent my copy to the University library where I can have access to it, and where the public can have access to it as well. I have let it be known in the public library and other places that these books are available there. I believe that if some of our libraries were supplied with the sessional papers, and if the members of Parliament were not supplied with so many, it would be an improvement. The publications of the Department of Agriculture are, as a rule, very valuable, and I should like to see a wider distribution of them.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: I believe that a great deal of public money is wasted in publishing and distributing Government reports that are not read by anybody. I and others have studied the matter, and I think it can be safely said that a saving of half a million dollars per annum could easily be made if more regard for economy were displayed in the distribution of these parliamentary publications. Only a few short days ago a report went through here, perhaps unnoticed, by which the usual allotment of the copies per member has been reduced to one. Henceforth for a year my hon. friend will not be burdened with more than one copy of each parliamentary publication. Apart from that a great saving can be effected, because there go to members of Parliament, newspaper offices and elsewhere a great many publications that they do not need and that are simply a burden to them. The Department of Trade and Commerce have a system by which they ascertain by means of return postcards whether their publications are desired or not, and the same rule could be applied to all parliamentary publications, so that no publications would go to those who did not desire them and had no use for them. I rose simply to tell my hon. friend that he will not be burdened as much as he was before, although, even after this, he may be burdened more than he wants to be.

Mr. BURRELL: Some of the remarks which have been made are absolutely true, although I think they apply more to the other departments than to the Department of Agriculture. The rule in the Department of Agriculture is that every farmer in Canada, if he applies, can get all our literature; or if any member wants to give a list of the farmers to whom he would like to have it sent, they are put on our list and receive our publications. We find that is the only method to pursue, because if hon. members had to distribute our publications themselves, there would be a duplication and a lot of unnecessary work On our experimental farm list we have more than 80,000 names, and we issue more than 2,000,000 publications every year, and a lot of this matter is very highly appreciated and is doing a lot of good. If the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Douglas) or the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Hugh Clark) know of any people to whom they want us to send this literature we shall be only too glad to send it. We do not charge for doing so, because there is a feeling in Canada against paying for Government publications, and we have made a charge only in the case of some expensive publications, of which there is quite a limited issue.

Mr. McCRANEY: My observations did not apply in any sense to the publications of the Department of Agriculture, because I have always found them excellent, and they are the class of publication for which I would like to see the money provided.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Would the minister give me some information as to the scarcity of these pamphlets at present? I understand from one of the officers of the department that the supply has been practically exhausted, and that is why I wish the minister would have more of them published.

Mr. BURRELL: As a matter of fact, there is not a great call for many of the bulletins and they have been allowed to go out of print. This year, in consequence of the campaign we have been carrying on in connection with our agricultural work, there has been such an enormous demand for a number of the bulletins and pamphlets that the supply has been practically exhausted; but we are putting in fresh orders to have them issued again, so that, although in some cases there may be a scarcity, we shall soon be able to remedy that.

Mr. BRODER: One thing that should not be overlooked is that the same bulletin will not suit all sections of the country. Why not get those that will suit the different sections and publish more of them, and economize in that way? As far as blue books are concerned, the local newspapers which are supplied with all these documents, make very little use of them, and it would be better to have them sent by request. A great saving could be made in that way, and what was saved might be expended in increasing the issue of the agricultural bulletin which is so much desired by the people throughout the country.

Mr. McCREA: I understand the hon. member has in the employment of his department a Mr. Giard, who is thoroughbred live-stock commissioner. What are his duties and what is his remuneration? I understand that he has opened an office in Sherbrooke, and I would like to know the names of his employees, their salaries and their duties. I am asking for this not for the sake of criticism, but simply to know what has been done. My contention is that neither this Government nor any other Government has done what it should have done for the cause of agriculture; and any money legitimately and wisely spent for agricultural purposes will never have any criticism from me, because agriculture is one of the things that have been seriously neglected. If the minister cannot give me the information off-hand, if he will give it to me befor the end of the session, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. BURRELL: I can give it to my hon. friend when we come to the live-stock vote. Mr. A. W. Giard is representative of the live-stock branch for Quebec.

Mr. ROBB: Can the minister tell us if any progress has been made in the manufacture of butter and cheese in the Eastern Townships, or is there an increased exportation of cream to the United States from the Eastern Townships?

Mr. BURRELL: I am sorry I cannot tell my hon. friend that off-hand, but I will try to get the information before I get through with my Estimates.

Mr. ROBB: In the Montreal Gazette the statement is made that cream all the way from Stanstead through to Richmond was exported to the United States and that the farmers of that particular district proposed to ask the department to establish butter and cheese factories to off-set that exportation. The minister might also have that looked up.

Towards the encouragement of cold storage warehouses for the better preservation and handling of perishable food products, $200,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: How is this work progressing?

Mr. BURRELL: This is exactly the same vote that we have always put in. It is paid in six instalments for the encouragement of cold storage industries under our control; that is, we have control of the rates and give for each warehouse a grant based on 30 per cent of the cost of construction, the plant having to conform to our specifications and the warehouse having to be a public utility. This work has been in operation for a great many years, and we are carrying it on along the same lines.

Mr. GRAHAM: How many plants have you?

Mr. BURRELL: About twenty-six or twenty-seven scattered throughout the country. The practice has been followed not to establish or encourage them in districts where they will conflict with cold storage plants that are serving a public purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is there one at Brockville?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, it has had its fifth instalment. It was built at a total cost of $52,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the name of this company?

Mr. BURRELL: I have not the exact name. I will give my hon. friend the information this evening. I see that the fifth instalment is due in 1915, so they must have been established about five years ago.

Mr. LOGGIE: What is the cost of the cold storage at Port Hawkesbury, and how many instalments are still due?

Mr. BURRELL: The cost is $200,000, and the third instalment is due in February, 1916.

Mr. LOGGIE: What provision is there for the control of rates of cold storage plants after the instalments have been paid?

Mr. BURRELL: I do not think there is any provision of that kind, for it is practically impossible to carry it out. Of course, we have control during the time the instalments are being paid, because we can refuse

to pay if they do not carry out the conditions on which the subsidy is paid. It has had to be a question largely of good faith.

Mr. LOGGIE: After the instalments are all paid, I fancy the Government has not much real control over the rates or operation of the plants.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not know that we have. Of course, we never had.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the position in regard to the cold storage establishment at Edmonton?

Mr. BURRELL: The third instalment is due in February, 1916, so, apparently, two instalments have been paid.

Mr. OLIVER: Are there reports as to the operations of the establishment?

Mr. BURRELL: I presume that the cold storage commissioner would have that. We always send a man out before instalments are paid to see that everything is according to conditions.

Mr. KYTE: What is the amount of subsidy paid to the cold storage plant at Port Hawkesbury?

Mr. BURRELL: It is 30 per cent on the cost, the cost being $200,000. It is at the same rate as the subsidy paid to others.

Mr. KYTE: Will the payment of the balance depend on any inspection?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, we do not pay unless they conform to the requirements of the department.

Exhibitions, $250,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister is not lacking in information on this subject, for he has it at first hand. He will be able to inform not only the House but the department about these exhibits, particularly the big one.

Mr. BURRELL: If my hon. friend has any special questions to ask, I would like to direct what I have to say to answering those questions.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am willing to leave it to the minister to give us such information as he thinks best about the Canadian exhibit and how it sizes up with those of other countries. Also, he might tell us what benefit we shall derive as Canadians from the expenditure of this money. We should be glad to know about those who are in charge of this work, and any other points about our exhibit that deserve special mention. I think it would be very interesting to the country to have a report of that kind from the minister on his return from California.

5 p.m.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not wish to take up more of the time of the committee than is necessary, but I am glad to speak a word on this subject, as it is one in which I am interested and I know that that interest is shared by all. The man in charge of this work is Colonel Hutchison, the commissioner, who has been in the service of the department for about fifteen years. The long experience he has had in connection with other exhibitions has served him splendidly in this case. Two years ago, when the subject of a Panama-Pacific exposition was first spoken of, we had two deputations, one from San Diego and one from San Francisco, asking Canada to take part. We came to the conclusion that it would be impossible to take part in more than one exhibition, and, after consideration, we decided that the San Francisco exposition would be the most important. At that time I suggested to the Prime Minister that if Canada took part in the exhibition there, especially in view of the colossal scale on which the exhibition was to be carried out, we must make a first-class exhibition or not exhibit at all. I got the consent of the Prime Minister and of my colleagues, and later on the support of the House, to a vote that amounts practically to twice what we have ever spent in an international exhibition before. I have just had the pleasure and responsibility of going to assist in the dedication of the Canadian building and have had the advantage of seeing what they were doing. I can only say that the exhibition is an extraordinarily important one. And, although the war is undoubtedly doing some injury to it in preventing attendance from Europe, they are getting a tremendous attendance from all over their own country and from South America and Canada; and perhaps on the whole, the attendance will justify the expectations of the promoters. The prime minister has just suggested to me that I should say something about the general character of the exposition. It is pretty hard to describe in a word an affair so big as this, for they have spent $18,000,000 to $20,000,000 in connection with the various buildings. Nearly every state of the Union has a separate building, some of them very expensive and very beautiful. Practically all the nations in the world, all the leading nations with the exception, I think, of Germany and Austria, have buildings of their own and very large ex-

hibits. The French, the Italian and the Argentine exhibits are not quite ready; these nations are just completing their buildings. The other states and nations have their buildings practically completed and the exhibits installed.

So far as our own work is concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that not only has Canada the best exhibit it ever had at any exhibition, but it is quite evident we have been made the centre of attraction of the whole exhibition among the nations. We have the best exhibit and the best building, I think, of the whole exhibition.

Some hon members: Hear, hear.

Mr. BURRELL: If I felt justified in taking up the time of the committee, I could give any amount of testimony to this, because Californians have been most generous in their praise. I do not think I can do better than read a couple of very short extracts from newspapers published in prominent counties in California devoted to fruit-growing. The Merced California Sun, in the course of an editorial article entitled "The Feature of the Fair," says:

> The one thing on the exposition grounds that is attracting most attention and causing the most talk is the Canadian building and its contents. Wherever you go you hear people talking about it and advising others to see it. ... The Sun will not attempt a description of Canada's offering, further than to say that all of the vast resources of that great country are shown in a manner so original, so unique, so attractive that there is nothing else on the exposition grounds to compare with it. The Canadian building and its contents are in a class by themselves, and our advice to Merced visitors to the fair is to "See Canada First," and then see it again as often as your time will permit.

I wish to read a portion of another article from the Fresno, California, Republican, as follows:

> Every local booster in California ought to visit the Canadian building at the exposition, if for nothing but a visible demonstration that the best local advertising, is that which does not advertise the locality at all. Simply as an exploitation of the country and its resources, this Canadian building is incomparably the most skillfully presented exhibit on the grounds. The thing presented is not Nova Scotia, or Quebec, or Alberta or British Columbia, but Canada. After going through the building one feels that he has made a tour of Canada itself. Direct exploitation or promotion is tactfully kept in the background. The impression given is that the Canadian people, proud of their country, wish to share with all the world this enjoyment of its beauty and riches. The commerical suggestion is nowhere directly made, and yet almost unconsciously the impulsive comment of every visitor is "Let's go to Canada and buy a farm."

I could give dozens of similar quotations, but I shall not weary the committee by reading them. Colonel Hutchison and the members of the permanent staff who have been doing this work for a great many years, deserve great credit for the work which they have accomplished in the face of tremendous competition. Colonel Hutchison has given the most loyal service. He has marked abilities for this special kind of work, and, to use a phrase that is understood by all men, he has made a killing, so far as this particular undertaking goes. The Canadian building was the only one in the grounds which was completed and ready on the very day the Fair opened. It was crowded on that day, and has been crowded every day since. The people of California and all visitors have been absolutely generous in their appreciation of Canada's exhibit. It appeals to the American imagination that at a time when a small country like this has had the task of sending 50,000 of its citizens across the seas to fight the Empire's battles, it has also had the energy to take part in this great exposition, to put up one of the best buildings and to show the finest exhibit among all the exhibits of other nations of the world. I should like to add my appreciation of the hospitality and kindness that was extended to me as a Canadian during my visit to the exposition and my attendance at the dedication ceremonies. Nothing could exceed the warm and cordial feeling shown by the people of California towards Canada and Canadians and their warm appreciation of Canada's participation in the Panama-Pacific Exposition.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: A gentleman who is a former Canadian wrote me a few days ago saying that he was present at the exposition in San Francisco, and he asked me to tell the minister that as a former Canadian he was proud of the exhibit which Canada is making at that exposition. He sent me a copy of a leading newspaper published in the State of Washington, which gives an account of the exhibit made by that State. It says that the Washington State exhibit is a very poor one. The article says:

> That the Washington State exhibit at San Francisco is not a success is the preliminary report submitted to the Chamber of Commerce by L. Roy Slater who was asked by manager Gordon C. Corbaley to make an investigation and report.

The report is a lengthy one, but at the end of it the following reference to the Canadian exhibit is made:

> The Canadians have beaten everything in sight. They have the greatest exhibit, and better than all the rest of them combined. They have been shrewd enough to take advantage of our exposition to make their own exhibit the feature of the whole show, and it not only reflects great credit upon their country but upon the men who have charge of it.

So that we ought to congratulate the hon. minister on the splendid manner in which Canada's exhibit has been put before the people of the world.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am in a position to know that what the minister has said with regard to Canada's participation in this exposition is not at all exaggerated. I was in 'Frisco on Christmas Day and the day previous, and it was general talk then that Canada's exhibit was the only one ready for the opening of the fair. I had the opportunity of meeting a score or more of persons who had seen the exhibit, and I am sure that the newspaper reports which the minister has read are not at all exaggerated. The reports which I have had from Canadians and others is to the effect that the tastefulness of Canada's exhibit, the manner in which it was handled by Colonel Hutchison and the general management of it by the Department of Agriculture reflects great credit upon our country. In Los Angeles I met some persons who had been present at the opening of the exposition, and they were of the opinion that our representative there made himself persona grata. I do not wish to make the minister blush, but I believe that Colonel Hutchison and the department have produced in a difficult year a Canadian exhibit that, it is nothing more than fair to say, does very great credit to Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: In view of Canada's superior exhibit, is there any suggestion of having a Canadian day or a Canadian week? I have received a number of communications from former Canadians who say that they have been endeavouring to have the directors appoint a special period as a Canadian period, for one or two days or longer. If that were done, Canada would like to know about it, so that if they have any idea of attending the exposition they may be there on Canadian day or Canadian week, as the case may be.

Mr. BURRELL: We have been in the habit of doing something like that in connection with nearly all expositions in which we participate. We did have, in a sense, a special Canadian day when the dedication of the Canadian building took place. When I went there to deliver the formal dedication speech, the president of the exposition was present, together with the Governor of the state, the National commissioner and the mayor of the city. These officials gave speeches in particular honour of Canada and of the fact that Canada was participating in the Exposition. After that a reception was held upstairs for all Canadians who were present. This function was very widely advertised. At the same time, I do not think that the suggestion of a Canadian day is at all a bad idea. We have had in mind the idea of having later a Canadian day, and it would be well if this were done, to give Canadians an opportunity of singling out that special period for visiting the exposition.

Health of animals, $540,000.

Mr. D. C. ROSS (Middlesex West): I wish to bring to the attention of the minister a matter to which I referred this morning, and to which some weeks ago I called the attention of the Minister of Agriculture and the Prime Minister. It is a matter of great importance to the province of Ontario, old Ontario particularly. The principle has been accepted by both parties that farmers and grazers whose animals must be slaughtered for the public good to prevent the spread of any contagious disease shall be compensated. The Act is, however, an old one, and the compensation that the Government is allowed to give by Order in Council under the Act is not at present in keeping with the prices of cattle and hogs. Insurance companies and railway companies have raised the maximum amounts that they will pay in case of the death of cattle, and I think the Government should not lag behind at this time, especially as we are to-day threatened in Ontario with a very terrible disease. At present all a farmer can get for a grade animal that has been slaughtered in the public interest is $40. The minister well knows that that is no compensation in that case. All he can get for the killing of a grade hog is $15, which is a wholly inadequate compensation. I made the suggestion to the Prime Minister some time ago that the Government might introduce an amendment to the Act, because I do not see that anything else can bring about the result I desire to attain. I do not think it is too late yet for the Minister of Agriculture to bring in such an amendment.

He could easily raise the limit of $60 to $110, and the limit of $15 to what he thinks proper. It may be that the Government will not have to pay these prices, because the foot and mouth disease may not get into the country; but at present there is alarm in regard to it, and I think the Government ought to take the necessary precautions before the disease reaches the country. I should judge from what the minister has said to me in conversation that his idea would be that if the disease should come into Ontario, compensation should be made to the farmers by a measure which would be made retroactive. If the session is so far advanced that it is impossible to amend the Act, the minister's statement to me is some solace; but I think that my suggestion would be a much better solution, and I would submit it to the consideration of the minister and the Government.

I wish to say a word also about the publications of the department. They are issuing some splendid publications. The only trouble I see about them is that the members are not able to get as many copies of those publications as they would like to distribute. On making application, I was told that I could get six. There are publications in regard to the growth of small fruit, butter making, the preservation of cream for butter making, the culture of cabbage and asparagus and vegetables in general, which certainly would be very useful to all farmers and market gardeners. These pamphlets are exeellent. I think the minister should make a regulation that each member should be allowed to have at least 50 or 100 copies of these pamphlets instead of six.

Mr.. BURRELL: Referring to my hon. friend's conversation with me, while I did say that if the foot and mouth disease should unfortunately come into this country, necessitating the killing of cattle and the Act were altered, it would be made retroactive, I would not like to make any positive statement as to what alteration there might be. I do not fear that we shall have the foot and mouth disease. Of course, no man can say it is impossible, because there are at the present time, in spite of all efforts that have been made in the United States, 20 states under quarantine. The United States have killed about 100,000 animals, about 50,000 head of cattle and roughly about 50,000 hogs. Roughly speaking they have spent about $1,000,000 in compensation. That compensation is not fixed along the same line as ours because there the State bears one-half the expense and the federal authorities the other half, and the State has usually fixed the appraisement of the value. Speaking offhand I think that for pure bred animals their maximum valuation has been placed at about $125, where we have fixed the maximum at $150. We are, of course, not relaxing any precautions that we have taken. This is the fifth outbreak that has occurred in the United States since 1870, which was the year of the first outbreak, the last being in 1908. The present outbreak, of course, is by far the most severe they have ever had. They say they are getting it largely under control. I understand there is no outbreak in the country west of Illinois, but we do not feel justified in relaxing our restrictions although they have fallen rather harshly on certain interests. We felt, however, that the interests of the farmers were paramount and that we could not run the risk of getting foot and mouth disease in this country. As regards compensation, although I have a good deal of sympathy with what my hon. friend has said, it must be always borne in mind that while the principle of compensation has been accepted by this House and by the department, nearly every country in the world in its compensation has fixed its values at lower amounts than we have fixed in Canada. We did recognize some few years ago that the value of horses had increased so tremendously since the Act was first put on the Statute book that we should raise it from $150 to $200. I am not sure that it should not be raised on hogs as well. As to cattle, as a matter of fact, we have not had any disease scheduled which has entailed the killing of cattle so that that question has not been under consideration except in so far as it arises owing to the possibility of the foot and mouth disease getting into the country. The subject is a big one and a debatable one, and I question whether it would be wise at this late hour of the session to enter upon it. I will, however, promise my hon. friend that everything he has said will be given the most serious consideration by the department. I will be glad to bring the subject to the attention of my colleagues and I believe that something ought to be done. If the foot and mouth disease comes here I shall certainly give the suggestion of my hon. friend the most sympathetic consideration and endeavour to arrange compensation in such a way that there shall be no hardship or unfair loss coming on those whose herds happen to be affected.

Mr. OLIVER: The time to take care of a situation is before it arises rather than afterwards. If we are in imminent danger, as we must be—

Mr. BURRELL: I do not think we are.

Mr. OLIVER: —as we must be in imminent danger of the spread of this terrible disease, it seems to me the minister and the House would do well to make such preparation as would seem to be necessary so that when it comes we will be in the very best position to deal with it. The principle of compensation to farmers for animals slaughtered in the public interest is, I fancy, something like this: If the owner of the diseased cattle is going to suffer the loss of his cattle because of the disease, he is impelled by the ordinary instincts of self-preservation to try to shove that loss off on to his neighbour, that is to say, he will try to dispose of the diseased animal. Compensation is granted so that he will not have that inducement; but, if the compensation is far below the valuation, the inducement still remains. As a matter of fact, the compensation has, measurably, if not actually, to be brought up to the valuation of the animal, or else the purpose of the compensation is in a large measure lost. But after all, the amount of the compensation is only a small part of the transaction. The great object is the prevention of the spread of the disease, and the tremendously greater losses that might follow because of it. I speak somewhat feelingly on this question of compensation, because in our part of the country tremendous losses have been suffered through diseased hogs; and I know whereof I speak when I say that the owner who suspects disease in his herd is inclined to escape from the loss by disposing of the animals to other parties. I am not prepared to say what should be done as to valuation in the case of hogs or cattle. But I am prepared to say this: that in view of the imminent danger to Canada of this terrible foot and mouth disease, this Parliament could not better spend its time than in making whatever preparations are adequate and possible to meet that contingency.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not regard the danger as imminent because, since the outbreak of the disease last October, the United States authorities have been working at it practically all the time, and every month has seen them in a much stronger position to prevent the spread of the disease. Our restrictions are not relaxed at all: we are watching the matter very closely. I am glad to have heard my hon. friend speak as he has, because some people do not hold these views on compensation. It is a very big subject, and very debatable. As far as any reasonable compensation will assist in stamping out the disease, I am in favour of it; and we have to make the compensation reasonable, otherwise the owner of diseased stock would spread the disease.

Mr. OLIVER: I might bring to the notice of the minister a case at Edmonton, where the owner of some hogs that had to be destroyed had not yet received compensation when I left there. I brought the matter to the attention of the department and of the minister last session, I think.

Mr. BURRELL: I understand that on account of the large amount of hog cholera the vote was exhausted.

Mr. OLIVER: I hope that compensation will be given in this case, because the destruction of these hogs means ruin to the owner, and even the maximum compensation that the law allows will not be adequate to prevent his ruin. I certainly think this man should be compensated.

Mr. BURRELL: I quite appreciate that.

Mr. ROBB: Is there still an embargo against all animals coming into Canada from the United States?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

Mr. ROBB: Does it apply to remounts bought in the United States for shipment to England or France?

Mr. BURRELL: As I understand it, the special arrangements that were made some time ago for transport through the country of remounts, still obtain. I have not had an opportunity since my return of discussing the matter with the Veterinary Director-General, but I do not think there has been any change in the arrangements.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any provision for compensation for animals slaughtered on account of tuberculosis?

Mr. BURRELL: Some time ago an Order in Council was passed by which assistance in stamping out the disease could be given to municipalities of over 5,000 population. The regulations of this Order in Council provide for compensation a little more liberal, I think, than the compensation provided in the Act as it stands at present.

One or two municipalities, Ottawa and Winnipeg for instance, have had this matter under consideration with a view to taking advantage of the regulations.

Mr. BRODER: If an animal is really diseased, the owner does not get compensation at all.

Mr. BURRELL: Oh, yes.

Mr. BRODER: That is not generally done.

Mr. BURRELL: Oh, yes.

Mr. BRODER: He gets very little compensation if the animal is diseased.

Mr. EDWARDS: He does not get compensation until the disease is diagnosed by the Government inspector?

Mr. BURRELL: No; the fact of disease must be established.

Mr. ROSS: I should like to know why the Order in Council limits this compensation to towns and cities of over 5,000 population. I notice that subsection 3 of section 5 of the Order in Council says:

> Valuation shall be made by the inspector, and shall not exceed the maximum valuation for cattle as specified in section 6 of the Act.

So the valuation is just the same as in the Act.

Mr. BURRELL: We had a great deal of discussion about that. We have been urged again and again to do something to help in stamping out bovine tuberculosis, which, as my hon. friend knows, is a very great menace to the cattle of Ontario. At the same time, every government has always more or less shied from the subject, because of its magnitude and the extraordinary expenditure that would be involved if you were to introduce wholesale compensation. Of course, we have authority to deal with it, and so have the provinces; but only one, British Columbia, has taken up the matter itself. It has passed an Act providing for compensation for animals that are destroyed on account of disease. On account of the menace to the health of human life we came to the conclusion that we might perhaps do something to assist in stamping out the disease, and the reason why we finally dealt with cities and towns of over 5,000 population was because it was chiefly in the large cities and towns that the poor children were most exposed to the danger of impure milk. In the more scattered districts of the country people can look out for themselves a little better than those in the towns.

[Mr. Burrell.]

Again, in municipalities there is generally some system of control by licensing, but that very seldom prevails in the rural districts. Of course it might be said that it is not very logical to draw the line as we have done, but we thought we should first deal with cities of over 5,000 population for the reasons I have indicated.

> For the administration and enforcement of the Meat and Canned Foods Act, $275,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What work is done under this vote?

Mr. BURRELL: This is to pay for the inspection and control of all the abattoirs in the country. As my hon. friend knows, under the Meat and Canned Foods Act no one in Canada can ship meat from one province to another or out of the country unless from an establishment which is under Government control and inspection. We maintain a staff of inspectors who see the animals killed and the distribution of the carcase, who in fact watch the meat at every stage. Every diseased animal is condemned, and sometimes certain diseased parts only are condemned. This system of inspection ensures that nothing can be shipped from one province to another or out of the country unless it has been pronounced by the Government inspectors absolutely free from disease.

Mr. OLIVER: That does not apply to animals slaughtered for local sale?

Mr. BURRELL: No.

Mr. OLIVER: Even in the abattoirs?

Mr. BURRELL: At the abattoirs it would include everything. The legislation was enacted principally to protect our export trade, and it was then concluded that within its own boundaries a province might very well look after its own health and the inspection of meat. Some of the provinces have done so and some have not. If a firm like the Matthews Company or the Davies Company were killing and selling even in their own province, nothing could come out of their establishments that was not inspected.

Mr. OLIVER: Then there is nothing to prohibit any person else from killing and selling without inspection?

Mr. BURRELL: No.

Mr. EDWARDS: There is one difficulty in connection with this inspection which I wish to bring before the attention of the minister. Recently, I understand, the

Militia Department has advertised for a supply of meat for the barracks and military college at Kingston, and it is stipulated that the meat to be supplied requires Government inspection. It seems to me that this is another way of saying that the only meat that can be supplied will be meat from Toronto or Montreal or places where these large abattoirs are, and, as a result, the people of the locality surrounding Kingston are excluded from tendering, unless, of course, they get their supplies from these large firms. In that way this inspection has a tendency towards creating a monopoly or centralization, which I do not think is fair. Government inspection was designed to protect our export trade, but if Government inspection is required for the supply of meat to Government institutions then there would appear to be no alternative but to get that meat from the large meat packers whose products are inspected. I think the Government should carry this inspection system further, and that inspectors should be appointed in different centres. In Kingston is located the Royal Military College, the barracks, the Kingston penitentiary, the Rockwood Asylum, and it seems to me that in all fairness to the people of the district they should have an equal show with the big companies to tender to supply meat to these institutions. Why could not the Government appoint competent men to inspect the meat in these centres, so that the farmers of the district might be able to sell to Government institutions.

Mr. DOUGLAS: In the province of Alberta the question of monopoly comes up in another way. Under the provincial Act all meat killed at the abattoirs of the Swift Packing Company or P. Burns & Company has to bear the Government inspection stamp, and the city of Edmonton has made a regulation that no farmer is permitted to sell slaughtered meat unless it is killed at these abattoirs where, of course, it necessarily must bear the Government stamp. The farmers claim that this has a tendency to create a monopoly and to prevent competition in the sale of meat. The provincial Act requires that the animal shall be slaughtered in these abattoirs and inspected by the officers of the Agriculture Department.

Mr. BURRELL: You will have to get after your provincial Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. DOUGLAS: The point is whether it is wise to have the regulations in connection with the sale of meat so stringent as to create a monopoly. The complaint of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) is that there are not enough meat inspectors and that a monopoly is in consequence created, but in Alberta the monopoly is created by having too many inspectors.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The way out of it is to follow the example of the city of Toronto, which owns a municipal abattoir, from which the meat is supplied to all the local butchers. The city of Toronto has absolutely the best abattoir in Canada, and it has been a great success. There is no reason why the smaller towns should not follow that example and have all the local cattle killed in a well-regulated local abattoir. The people are entitled to protection even more than trade is entitled to protection, and while I agree with the member for Frontenac that there ought to be local inspectors, I see no means of remedying the difficulty other than by establishing municipal abattoirs.

Mr. BURRELL: The meat packers have often complained that the Militia Department does not buy from inspected plants because the Government makes the inspected plants live up to rather a rigid inspection. On the other hand, the view is expressed, as my hon. friend from Frontenac says, that this would create a monopoly. The Militia Department has refused to comply with the representations made to it, that the meat should be Government inspected, and what they do is to buy the meat themselves and make their own inspection. I rather think that when my friend from Frontenac says that this meat for the barracks in Kingston is subject to Government inspection, the meaning is that the inspection is by a departmental officer of the Militia Department and not by our inspectors in the abattoirs.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND: It seems most peculiar that all the meats for export are inspected by Government inspectors, while a large proportion of the meats which are consumed by the people at home are not inspected at all. As I understand it, the meats that are supplied to the soldiers in the London camp are not Government inspected, and I do not think that is right. I contend that it is an absolute impossibility for an inspector, no matter how efficient he may be, to detect from the dressed carcase whether the animal was diseased or not. When you come to look into the matter and find how many ani-

mals are really diseased and how many parts of these animals are diseased, it is quite a revelation. The percentage of meat killed in an abattoir that finds its way into the fertilizing plant is astonishingly large. I believe that Canadian live stock are becoming more subject to disease from year to year, and I think the day is not far distant, when in order to protect the health of our people the Government will find it necessary to adopt still more stringent regulations.

In order to protect the health of the people, a more reasonable compensation should be paid to those who suffer loss through having their animals destroyed for the purpose of eradicating such diseases. I do not like the idea of our own people being supplied with uninspected meats, whereas we have to have government inspection of all meats exported from Canada. The quicker this matter is remedied the better it will be for all concerned.

Arts and Agriculture—publication branch, $15,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is this new item?

Mr. BURRELL: Hitherto the separate branches have dealt with their own publications—they do so to some extent now—and up to last year and this year the vote was confined to the vote for the International Institute of Agriculture. We have separated that vote and are allowing that branch to deal only with the International Institute. The work of publication is increasing so rapidly that we are making a separate branch out of it, with Mr. Spencer at the head.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You will only have one publication now?

Mr. BURRELL: All our publications now except that of the International Institute will be under this branch. Probably the word "distribution" would be better than the word "publications," because it is a distribution of the publications of all the branches.

Mr. ROSS: Will the minister consider favourably or seriously my suggestion of giving each member the option of asking the department to supply him with 50 or 100 copies instead of 6 of any pamphlet published?

Mr. BURRELL: I have of course pointed out to my hon. friend the difficulty that arises in giving each member many copies of each publication, that practice leading to endless complications. As I have stated, however, we are going to consider the whole matter carefully, and I shall be glad to bear in mind what my hon. friend has suggested.

Mr. EDWARDS: There is one publication published recently by the department, called the War Issue of the Department of Agriculture. I read that through very carefully and secured as many copies of it as I could—less than half a dozen—and I think there is so much information in that bulletin in regard to the various countries engaged in this great war that the minister would be well advised to get out a number of them and give to each member at least 100 copies. I am sure the general public would be very glad to have it in their possession.

For the development of the live stock industry, $550,000.

Mr. NEELY: What is the reason for this increase of $150,000?

Mr. BURRELL: We are carrying on the same work practically that we have been for the last year or two, but this particular increase has special reference to the encouragement of live stock in connection with the various large exhibitions of the country. My hon. friend may know—some hon. members do know—that there was an agitation some time ago to establish a western national live stock show somewhat along the lines of the one in Chicago There was very great difficulty in working it out; and although I had a great deal of sympathy with the idea, it seemed to me it was no good carrying it out unless all parts of the country were united, and it was apparently impossible to work out a scheme. The different live stock interests of the country, east and west, seemed to have a good many differences, and I could not see that they were getting very much further forward with the scheme. Therefore, I suggested to them that I would ask the Government and the House to approve a vote which would be quite a new departure as far as we were concerned, that is, which would give direct assistance on the live stock side to all exhibitions in the country that came up to a certain standard. It was for that purpose that this vote of $150,000 was put in. It is of course impossible for the Federal Government to assist all the smaller exhibitions; but what we had in mind was that those exhibitions which

came up to a certain standard in the way of live stock should be assisted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What standard?

Mr. BURRELL: What we have laid down with regard to assistance is that there must be an expenditure on the part of the exhibition of at least $5,000 in prize money for the various classes of live stock before we can assist them with any financial grant. That would practically include all the greater shows of the country, both winter shows and fall exhibitions, which made live stock a really important feature. We had to draw the line somewhere, and I asked the officers of our live stock branch to get into contact with all the leading members of the industry, and to try to get a fair idea as to the best way of assisting them. The conditions governing this assistance may be briefly stated as follows:

Fair associations, whose shows are open in all classes to the whole of Canada, and which have paid out in the utility classes of live stock and poultry at their last preceding show the sum of $5,000 or over, will be given a grant equal to 50 per cent of the actual amount paid out, the maximum grant to any show not to exceed the sum of $5,000. Fair boards, when making application to the Live Stock Branch for this grant, must forward a certified and properly subscribed statement of the auditor's report of all prize money paid out at the last show in the classes previously referred to; also a copy of the proposed prize list for the succeeding year. The revising of the prize list shall be subject to the approval of the Live Stock Commissioner. That was with the idea that we should have some control really useful in the assisting and development of the industry. All pure-bred live stock exhibited at shows which receive the benefit of this grant must be registered, in the name of the exhibitor, in the Canadian National Live Stock Records. In all questions of policy or matters of dispute, the decision of the live stock commissioner shall be final.

There may be details to work out; but I think the live stock men of the country felt generally that some assistance of that kind was absolutely necessary to prevent some of the shows from going under, and it, also, according to them, would prove a tremendous stimulus in this particular industry to the perpetuation of a better class of stock and to increasing the stock, which is somewhat below par in this country as it is in the United States. I think some assistance of this kind is necessary, although it means considerable increase in this time of financial stringency, and will have the support of those members of this House who believe that the live stock industry is of extraordinary importance in our general scheme of agriculture.

Mr. ROBB: Will the minister tell us how many exhibitions in Canada come up to the standard he has named?

Mr. BURRELL: It would be very hard to give my hon. friend the exact information; but I remember going over the question before I left for California, and I should think twenty-five or thirty would come under that rule.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do I understand from the minister that the standard would have to be $5,000 or more expended at the last preceding exhibition for pure bred stock only?

Mr. BURRELL: No, not necessarily for pure-bred cattle—for all utility stock.

Mr. NEELY: It is almost six o'clock, but I would ask the minister, when he resumes with his Estimates, if he will be good enough to give the committee a statement of the number of pure-bred animals that have been purchased under this department in the various provinces of Canada in the past year, and where these animals have been placed.

Mr. BURRELL: I think I can give my hon. friend that information.

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

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 107, respecting a patent of John Millen & Son, Limited.—Mr. Webster.

Bill No. 120, for the relief of Cecil Howard Lambert.—Mr. Sam. Sharpe.

SUPPLY.

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

Arts and Agriculture—for the development of the live stock industry, $550,000.

Mr. BURRELL: The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) asked me for a list

of animals purchased. It is as follows: Stallions: Prince Edward Island, 2; Nova Scotia, 3; New Brunswick, 2; Quebec, 35; Ontario, 6; Manitoba, 6; Saskatchewan, 18; Alberta, 25. Bulls: Maritime Provinces, 39; Quebec, 110; Ontario, 32; Manitoba, 30; Saskatchewan, 127; Alberta, 70; British Columbia, 6. Boars: Prince Edward Island, 3; Nova Scotia, 9; New Brunswick, 5; Quebec, 71; Ontario, 9; Manitoba,9; Saskatchewan, 50; Alberta, 28; British Columbia, 1. Rams: Prince Edward Island, 55; Nova Scotia, 86; New Brunswick, 18; Quebec, 206; Ontario, 27; Manitoba, 7; Saskatchewan, 5; Alberta, 12.

Mr. NEELY: Were these animals purchased and distributed in the same province?

Mr. BURRELL: Occasionally they are taken from one province to another, but the general rule is that where we can get satisfactory animals, they are purchased and distributed as far as possible in the same province.

Mr. NEELY: So far as this item is concerned, and the somewhat considerable increase of $150,000 over the vote of last year, I have nothing to offer but the most entire approval.

The vitalizing of this department by the minister seems to me to be one of the best things that he has done since assuming the responsibility of the position which he now occupies. The live stock industry of Canada is a most important branch of agriculture and, speaking for a comparatively new district in Western Canada, I must say that the development of this policy of supplying pure-bred male animals in districts where the conditions made this necessary is in my judgment a splendid move on the part of the Minister of Agriculture. In my own constituency a number of these animals have been placed and the improvement in the quality and standard of the live stock has become more and more marked as this policy has become more and more developed.

If I have any fault to find with the expenditure under the head of agriculture by the present Administration and the preceding Administration, it would be the paucity of money, the smallness of the amount asked for the development of the agricultural industry throughout Canada as compared with the amounts that are spent in the other departments of the Government. We all recognize, more to-day than ever before, that agriculture is the basic industry of this country. We spend large sums on the development of our transportation facilities. Why do we require these large expenditures on transportation facilities? Is it not that we may take the products of the farm to the ultimate consumer and bring back to the farmers the products of the factories of our towns and cities in the various parts of Canada? We spend enormous sums on transportation facilities. We have to spend enormous sums on public works throughout the country; on the improvement of harbours and ports and in other developments which are not so profitable even as the development of our transportation facilities and our ports and harbours. Let us take the total vote under the head of agriculture. We find that the Government are asking this year for something like $3,300,000. That, of course, does not cover the vote for civil government, for the administration of departmental affairs. In my judgment if any fault can be found with the amount we are voting under the head of agriculture, it is that in comparison with other departments of Government the farmer of this country is not getting his due and proper share. It is only—and I must give this credit to the present minister—it is only within the past two or three years that Canada has devoted any particular or special attention to the development of that great branch of agriculture, namely, the live stock industry. We appreciate to-day what that industry means to us. We are anxious to see the breeders of Canada using every measure possible to keep up the number and quality of animals necessary not only for the feeding of our own people but for the supplying of meat products to the outside world. I have been watching the development of this policy of the distribution of male animals since its inauguration, and I must say that, as far as my observation goes, in Western Canada and particularly in Saskatchewan, I find nothing but approval and praise for the manner in which the policy is being carried out under the present Live Stock Commissioner who I believe is a man who understands his business, a thoroughly practical man, who has spent his life in the development of the live stock industry on his own behalf as well as on behalf of his fellow stock breeders throughout Canada. In the development of the policy of the department, in the matter of meeting the views and requirements of many districts in Saskatchewan, I have no fault to find. I believe that the Commis-

sioner is fulfilling his duty in a way worthy of approval and praise. For the benefit of the minister I would say that in my judgment there is no item of expenditure in his department which brings such definite, practical results to the farmers of the country through aid given to the live stock industry, as this item of $400,000 or $500,000 which is devoted to the promotion of the policy of furnishing pure-bred male animals in the districts throughout Canada where those animals are necessary because of local conditions.

I have been told the policy of the Government in buying these animals and putting them in new districts is an injury to the stock breeders who have similar animals for sale. I fail to see that there is any strength in that contention. It is true that the policy of organizing in localities companies to whom these animals are furnished may to some extent limit the number of sales by private individuals because of the fact that one of these animals furnished by the Government will take the place of a number of animals that would be required if private individuals had to furnish them for themselves.

On the other hand, the injury that might be done to the stock breeder who has animals for sale would be far outweighed by the benefit to the large districts in the newer provinces of Canada where the people are quite unable to furnish themselves with pure-bred stock. For my part I would say that the minister instead of shortening sail, should crowd on sail; he should add to the amount yearly, and give the man at the head of the department the freest possible hand in developing this policy. He should encourage him in every possible way.

While I am on my feet I wish to bring another matter in connection with this item to the attention of the minister and of the Government and of the House and of the country. We are spending a certain amount of money for the purpose of improving the quality of the live stock of this country. Now, there is one branch of the live stock industry that in my judgment has, on account of the war, the greatest opportunity it has had for years, or probably will have for many years to come. I refer to the horse industry. I will not presume to speak for the East, but I am expressing a very widespread feeling throughout Western Canada when I say that there seems to be a very strong suspicion that the number of horses being purchased at the present time from horse breeders in the West is far and away below the number they might naturally expect to sell under present conditions. In other words, although this Government have appointed men in Western Canada for the purpose of buying horses for war purposes, we have felt up to the present and we feel now that only a very very small number of horses have been purchased compared with the number that might have been purchased if the Government had been earnest in its efforts to secure as many horses for military purposes as the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta could furnish. I understand that a considerable number of horses have been purchased in the eastern provinces, but as I said before I do not presume to speak for Quebec or the Maritime Provinces, nor for Ontario, for which the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) can speak very well. The Minister of Agriculture need not come back at me and say that I am discussing something outside of his department; for I will not accept that as an answer, and for this reason. The Minister of Agriculture is the member of this Government who is responsible for looking after the agricultural interests of this country. He has in the Estimates this item of $550,000 for the promotion of the live stock industry. Now what does he mean by spending $550,000 for the promotion of the live stock industry if he will not enable the horse breeders of the country to take advantage of the greatest opportunity they ever had of selling horses? Whether or not the responsibility for purchase lies with some other member of the Government, and I presume it lies with the Militia Department. The Minister of Agriculture is responsible for seeing that the stock breeders of the country get a square deal at the present time. I repeat that there is a widespread feeling that the horse breeders have not been able to sell as many horses as they might reasonably have expected to sell. I do not want to give this to the House as mere hearsay. I am told by a member on this side of the House—and he is prepared to back up what I say; I am prepared to give his name—that not only has no special assistance been given by the Government in securing markets for our horses outside of Canada, but on the contrary buyers of horses for foreign countries have actually been warned off Canadian soil by this Government. I am told that purchasers for the British Government have been requested by those acting in authority for this Government to leave Canadian

soil, and to confine their purchases of horses to the United States and other countries. They were told to leave the Canadian horse market alone until the Canadian Government had secured all the horses they required, so that the price should not be advanced against this Government. I do not know how far this statement is true, but I know that the purchasing agent of the British Government stated to a member of this House that that was the condition of affairs. If there is any truth in the statement, then this Government is guilty of malicious, almost criminal, injury to the horse breeders of this country. What is the use of spending money for the purpose of improving the live stock business of this country if the Government do not assist our stock breeders to secure a market when that market is available? There was an opportunity for our stock breeders to get rid of a surplus of animals, many of which were unfitted for farm work, but the Government did not help them to secure that opportunity. So far from helping them, according to this statement they put obstacles in the way of our stock breeders availing themselves of a market which was brought to their door. The opportunity was turned away by the action of this Government. I want to be fair, but I want to tell the Minister of Agriculture and the Government that that is the feeling throughout a large part of this country both in the East and in the West. For some reason or other, while French and English buyers are plentiful in the United States and down as far as Texas, in Canada there is a woeful dearth in the demand for cavalry and artillery horses. If there is such an embargo placed on purchases from outside by this Government, it is up to this Government to take that embargo off at once; it is the duty of the Minister of Agriculture on whose shoulders rests responsibility to protect the interests of the agriculturist, the stock-breeder, and the farmer, to see that the embargo is lifted. The number of horses purchased or likely to be purchased by the Canadian Government is only a very small percentage of the number of horses which are for sale at present. Surely the stock-breeder and the farmer are not to be deprived of this opportunity to get a good price for their surplus stock, simply because the Canadian Government wishes to monopolize this market for themselves, so that they may purchase horses cheaper than they otherwise could. We all believe that our agricultural industry is the most important in Canada; we believe that Canada is playing to-day its greatest part in the world's drama by the food supplies which it is able to furnish to the allied armies in Europe. If it be important, as it is important, and as the members of the Government tell us, it is important, that production should be stimulated in every possible way, then we must carry that proposition one step further and we must see that the necessary markets are found for this increased production. If this suspicion of which I have spoken is not well founded, then it is only fair and just to the Government that they should have an opportunity to make a full denial. We would like to know the truth about this.

We in the West have no fault to find with the price we have received for our grain, but we know that up to date the horses we have sold have been sold at a very moderate and reasonable price. I believe that in Western Canada we have furnished horses for military purposes at a lower price than they have been secured for anywhere else in Canada or anywhere else in the United States. I know that the minister has been absent on foreign soil from his department for some weeks, and it is possible this has not been brought to his attention, but I tell him now that if he wishes to assist the live stock industry in this country—and he evidently is trying to do it under this vote for the improvement and development of the live stock industry—he must take the responsibility of seeing to it that any farmer in Canada, who has a horse suitable for military purposes which he wants to place on the market, be not deprived of the opportunity to do so. I trust the minister will see to it that the Government will encourage foreign horse buyers to come to Canada even though it means that when the Canadian Government comes to buy the horses they require they may have to pay a few dollars more to the farmer who is entitled to this extra profit if he raises the right kind of horse.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: As the representative of a horse-growing province, I have had occasion to bring the matter referred to by the hon. member (Mr. Neely) to the attention of the Government on more than one occasion. If my hon. friend from Humboldt were as anxious to obtain first-hand information as he apparently is to create some sort of prejudice in the minds of the people against the Government, he

would have learned that the Administration has been acting in this matter absolutely along the line that one would expect, having regard to our responsibilities as a part of the British Empire. I ventured to bring the matter to the attention of the Prime Minister himself on two or three occasions, and I found that there were many aspects of the case which, because of certain imperial responsibilities and international complications in connection with the matter, he could not even discuss with a member of Parliament, much less with Parliament itself. I was content that the matter should be left entirely in his hands, and I know that other members of the House who are conscious of the enormous responsibilities that the Government of Canada has to carry at this time, were content that the matter should be dealt with by the Prime Minister as best he could.

I am sure that no farmer in Western Canada and no citizen of Canada will believe that the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) is any more anxious that the farmers of Western Canada should sell their horses, than is the Government of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) said that the Government maliciously did this.

Mr. NEELY: I said if they did it, it was a malicious thing to do.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well, and in the very next sentence the hon. gentleman referred to the proud place that Canada is taking in this war. If Canada is taking a proud place in this war, it is because those who are responsible for the Government of Canada are acting in accord and in unison with the Imperial Government at Westminster. So far as I have been able to ascertain, having brought the matter to the attention of the Government on behalf of the horse-breeders of Alberta, the action which the Government has taken is in harmony with the imperial responsibilites of Canada.

Mr. NEELY: Will the hon. gentleman tell me what he means by the action which the Government has taken? What action did the Government take?

Mr. BENNETT: The Government, so far as I could ascertain from the inquiries I have made, was not in a position to disclose to me or to this House everything that might be connected with military operations. I was advised, as other members of this House who inquired were advised, that the Imperial Government thought that it was not an opportune time to purchase horses in Western Canada, but that because of certain international possibilities horses were being purchased elsewhere for the present. I was assured, not only by the Government but by a British officer whom I met, that we who live in Western Canada need not have the slightest fear but that every possible facility will be afforded us in due course to sell every horse we have that is suitable for military purposes or for any other purpose. That I believe to be so, and I accepted it because I believe that the Government is as well seized with a sense of its responsibility as is any private member of this House. The Government being possessed of large information which we could not ask it to furnish us with, and which in the ordinary course of events it could not very well furnish to us, I conveyed to my constituents and to the people of the province in which I reside the information that everything that could be done by this Government, in view of the position we occupy, would be done in due course to give them an opportunity to sell their horses. That I believe to be the case. Perhaps Alberta is the greatest horse-producing part of Canada; but I have ascertained from inquiries I have made that the horses we now have upon the ranges are not fitted without a great deal of training for either artillery, transport or cavalry purposes, and our ranchers are now training their horses, because an untrained horse that will shy at an automobile is not exactly the kind of horse to place near the firing line beside big guns. In the ordinary course of events, a transport horse is not a very good transport animal if, coming into a city, he is afraid of an automobile. What would he do when he would be close beside the operations that are being carried on on the plains of Belgium or France? It requires months and years of training to make a cavalry horse. As regards the number of horses purchased, the hon. gentleman must have been misinformed, because horses have recently been purchased, not in hundreds but in thousands, in the western provinces. The number of horses assembled at Brandon at one time was 1,800, and more are about to be purchased for the third contingent. The first thing we have to do in Western Canada to find a market for our horses is to have them trained for transport, cavalry and artillery purposes, and my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Warnock) will bear me out that the range

horse is not very well adapted for the purposes that I have mentioned. I am also informed that as the war progresses, the class of horses we have on our plains will be in the greatest demand, although just now that it is not the class that is required. In due course, if we faint not, our horses will command the highest possible price, and there will be no reason for us to have any complaint because of lack of opportunity to sell. The farmers that I have met in Western Canada, when they have understood the situation, have not ventured to complain in the terms in which the hon. gentleman has; but they have been content to accept the assurance of the Government that every possible effort is being made to assure a ready sale for our horses consistent with the demands upon us by reason of the military operations of the Empire and its Allies.

Mr. NEELY: I am sure I am very gratified to the hon. member for Calgary for his explanation—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to say a few words before he goes on. He will realize that the allied powers, in regard to horses, as to which the wastage is enormous, had to look pretty far ahead in the early months of the war, and certain arrangements were made, which I am not at the moment free to disclose to the House, but which I would have no objection to mention privately to my hon. friend or to any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House; indeed, I have already communicated them to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who desired some information on the subject. Not only was that the case, but it came to our attention some two or three months ago that the horses required by the various allied powers were not always horses of the same type or class; that one power, for example, might find use for horses which would not be required in the service of another power. Arrangements had to be made, as I understand, between the powers, as to where the provision of horses that would be required could be obtained, and with those arrangements, which were arrived at under a very distinct understanding, we could not very well presume to interfere. We did, however, make the suggestion some four or five weeks ago that there was a certain class of horses in Canada which were not required by one of the powers, but which might be found very useful for the purposes of another power, and that notwithstanding the arrangements first entered into to which I have no more than alluded, we hoped it might be possible that an opportunity might be given for the purchase in Canada of horses of that type by the power to which I have last referred. The arrangements and conditions which have been brought to our attention are not only of a confidential, but to a certain extent of a very complicated character, and I hope my hon. friend will do us the justice of believing that it has been our greatest desire to bring about a condition of affairs under which the farmers of Canada, whether in the East or in the West, will have an opportunity to dispose of their horses at remunerative prices. I would be very glad to supplement what I have said in a private interview with my hon. friend, if he will be good enough to give me an opportunity.

Mr. NEELY: I am sure I am very gratified for the trouble the right hon. the Prime Minister has taken to give us some explanation in regard to the situation, and I quite understand that there may be conditions surrounding this matter that cannot very well be given to the public or even to this House; but the information which was given to me and on which I based my remarks a few moments ago was not along the lines of the information given by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) and just now by the Prime Minister. My information was that the British Government actually sent their agent to Canada to purchase horses, and that the Canadian Government, wishing to retain the Canadian horses for itself, had requested the British buyers not to pursue the purchasing of horses on Canadian soil until the Canadian Government had itself secured at fair and reasonable prices a sufficient number with which to equip the Canadian contingents. If the Government says that there is no truth in that report, that settles the matter so far as I am concerned, and I am certainly quite ready and prepared to take the word of the Prime Minister to that effect. The Prime Minister was not here when I referred to the widespread impression that the Government of Canada was responsible for the withdrawal from Canada of British horse buyers, because of the necessity of the Canadian Government to secure a sufficient quantity of horses at a reasonable price, which price of course, would be enhanced if this Governhad to compete with the purchasers for the British and French Governments. If the Prime Minister will tell us whether that

information is right or wrong, that will clear up the matter so far as I am concerned.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no doubt whatever that persons who have been commissioned to purchase horses for the expeditionary forces wished to be in a position in which they could be absolutely certain of securing a sufficient number of the requisite type, not only to supply the first needs of the forces but also to make good the enormous wastage that must necessarily take place as soon as these forces arrived at the front. But I can, I think, explain to my hon. friend that there was another predominating cause which led to the withdrawal, temporarily, from Canada of the British buyers. I should not feel free to enter into the reason for it tonight, but at some future day I may be able to explain it to the House. It would not be proper to do so at the moment, though I should have no objection to communicating it privately to my hon. friend, if he desires to know it.

Mr. ROBB: Would the Prime Minister say if the Government has prohibited the exportation of Canadian horses to the United States?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With respect to horses and also with respect to other animals and commodities that were of a certain character, such as might make them useful to an enemy if they came into their possession, or the exportation of which might weaken the resources of the Empire for the purpose of carrying on the war, we received suggestions early in the succession of events after the outbreak of hostilities, and have received such suggestions from time to time since, from the Imperial Government; and with few exceptions —I think with no exceptions, but sometimes after a discussion by cable—we have carried out the view which they thought would be essential for the welfare of the Empire and the maintenance of our strength for the great conflict in which we are engaged. My recollection is that the exportation of horses, and other articles as well, was prohibited except to British possessions. There is an enormous list of articles embraced in the different orders in council. The same course was pursued here as was pursued in Great Britain. Recently, in Great Britain, all these Orders in Council have been consolidated into a general Order in Council for the purpose of convenience.

9 p.m. We have been engaged during the last three or four weeks in consolidating our various Orders in Council, and the work is now practically done, so that we hope at a very early day to pass an Order in Council which will give a complete list of the articles the exportation of which is prohibited, whether to all countries other than British dominions or to specified countries. I might explain that arrangements have been made with the Imperial Government by which a certain discretion is to be exercised by the Governor in Council or a minister of the Crown, with regard to the exportation of certain articles—or the importation of certain articles, for that matter. If it should appear that the exportation of certain articles generally prohibited, is important for certain reasons to a particular country for a stated period or for some particular purpose, the Governor in Council or the minister may have the right to issue a license for that exportation. On the other hand, it has been found sometimes essential to permit the importation from German or Austrian sources of certain articles essentially necessary for some institution in this country, for instance, an agricultural college, or for the purposes of some industry in Canada, the maintainance of which is important in the public interest. These instances, however, are only occasional occurrences, and for the most part, the Orders in Council passed have been strictly observed and have not been departed from except with the general or special sanction of the Imperial authority.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) was in good company when he found fault with the Government for sending British buyers to the United States. I have here a copy of the Winnipeg Telegram which also finds fault because the British buyers were sent to Chicago to buy horses. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) apparently did not quite know what sort of horses were required for cavalry purposes, or what sort were bought in the United States. He made the statement that the Alberta horses were not suitable, nor trained, for cavalry purposes. He is in conflict with the Winnipeg Telegram, for they make a statement that the horses bought in Chicago are wild horses from the southwestern prairies and that the stock men there have secured cowboys to train them.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I did not say the horses were not fit; I said they had not been trained off the range, and it is the range horse untrained that is unfit. But those in the United States, anticipating the market, have taken the trouble to have them trained, as I ascertained from personal inquiry in the United States a short time ago. The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Warnock) knows about it.

Mr. ROBB: They train them in the yard after taking them from the prairie.

Mr. BENNETT: Not always.

Mr. ROBB: That is the statement in the Winnipeg Telegram. Accepting the statements from the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) that they are responsible for comparatively few horses having been purchased by these British buyers in Canada so far, would it not be fair to the Canadian farmer, especially as he has carried his horses through the winter, at a time when oats were higher than they have been for many years in Canada, and hay also high and scarce, to advance the price for the horses bought hereafter in Canada? The price paid for the military horses that were bought is an arbitrary price fixed by the buyer, and the farmer was simply told he might take it or leave it. I do not now find fault with that, for perhaps that is the only way it could be done. But would not the Government take it into consideration that the farmer has carried that horse through the winter though he could have sold his oats at a profit, and that he is entitled to a profit on the horse.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think there is force in what the hon. member suggests. I am not sure that the price is arbitrarily fixed at the present time. My recollection does not agree with the statement of the hon. gentleman though I do not wish to speak with certainty, because it is only an impression, though a distinct impression. Of course, my hon. friend will understand that a Government buying a large number of horses over a great stretch of territory such as is comprised within Canada must endeavour to be pretty careful to get value for the money. It is said—I am not very familiar with the subject myself—that one may not always get good value unless he keeps his eyes open. I do not think that buyers have gone elsewhere, solely for the reason which the hon. gentleman suggests; indeed, I know to the contrary. But inasmuch as, owing to causes upon which I shall not dwell at the moment and to which it is not desirable that I should refer, our farmers have kept and fed their horses during the winter, I really agree with the hon. gentleman that this is a circumstance which may fairly be taken into consideration, and I think it will be taken into consideration.

Mr. McMILLAN: Would it not be wise, now that the farmers are promised a market for their horses, for the Department of Agriculture to establish some sort of bureau by which the Government would have information as to the approximate number of horses there are available in Canada at the present time for war purposes? I understand that three weeks after the outbreak of war there was not a horse for sale in England, for the reason that a bureau had been established and upon the outbreak of the war men were sent in every direction and all available horses in the whole country were picked up.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member means that they took a census of the horses.

Mr. McMILLAN: Yes, the facts concerning marketable horses are kept on record, as I understand it. I think that a somewhat similar system should be adopted in this country. I had occasion to go to Montreal to satisfy myself as to the situation with regard to horses, and I had the privilege of looking over 1,030 horses which were turned into two large yards. As many of these horses had come from my own county, I asked the gentleman in charge what the cost of the horses was to the British Government, and I was amazed to hear that they were paying $185 plus $5 for every horse in these yards. Horses may be taken from Glengarry to Montreal at a cost of $1, and the amount paid the Glengarry man for one of these horses was only $110 or $115, by reason of the fact that there was no competition. The matter was entirely in the hands of the gentlemen who came into the county to buy the horses. As hay and grain were scarce, the farmers were obliged to let the horses go at whatever they could get for them. The result was that for good, sound, young horses, suitable for military purposes, the farmers obtained only $110 or $115. If you place the purchase of horses in the hands of any one man, he will take advantage of the situation and pay the farmers whatever he thinks fit. If the farmers had received the amount paid by the British Government for the horses delivered in Montreal, they would be perfectly satis-

fied, but there was a difference of $65 in respect of every horse that left my county between the price paid to the person selling and the price paid in Montreal. While I was there I asked this gentleman also why he and his associates were leaving Canada—they were leaving next week—and I was informed that they were leaving at the request of the Canadian Government, who had asked them to discontinue purchasing horses in Canada. He explained to me, when I asked him why this should be, that the Dominion Government required horses for their own military purposes in Canada, and that it would be unwise for the British Government to go into competition with them until such time as the Canadian Government should secure what horses they themselves required. It was pointed out that the price of horses would naturally be increased by competition. I do not propose to make any charges; I am willing to accept the statement of the Prime Minister that there was good reason for doing that, but if that is the situation, it is a serious matter, and one to which the Government should give their immediate attention. The price of horses should be allowed to advance, because at the present time an opportunity is offered by which we can restore this important industry to its proper standing. Unless you allow the British and French Governments to come into the market and buy up the surplus horses in Canada, after the war is over the price of horses will drop too low to make their sale profitable to the Canadian farmers.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not absolutely clear as to the average price that has been paid for horses in Canada by the Canadian Government, but I am quite sure that it is much higher than the price mentioned by my hon. friend; I think it runs up to $170. I can assure my hon. friend that we have really had a great many complaints from various sources in the country because the Government insisted upon buying direct from the farmer instead of from dealers. I myself have been assailed with a great many complaints in this respect. It has been the policy of the Government to buy horses direct from the farmer, and if any different practice has been pursued in my hon. friend's county, I should like to know of it and to make inquiry. Sir Adam Beck has had charge of the purchasing of horses in Ontario, and I have seen him three or four times in regard to the matter. He assures me that the policy of the department has been carried out throughout the province of Ontario.

Mr. McMILLAN: I was referring to the purchase of horses by the British Government, and to the fact that there was a large difference between the price the farmer received and the price the British Government paid. I was suggesting that the Government should look into this matter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was under the impression that my hon. friend was referring to horses purchased by the Canadian Government. I do not deny that the persons who have been commissioned to buy horses for the Canadian Government were very anxious indeed that they should have an opportunity of obtaining a sufficient supply for the Canadian expeditionary force and of making some provision for wastage. The idea was that the horses for our own expeditionary forces should be purchased in Canada and that a condition should not be brought about under which we would have to go to some other country to obtain horses of the requisite type. So far as the purchase of horses by British buyers in the United States is concerned, three causes for this were operating. To these I have already alluded; I should be very glad to explain them to my hon. friend, and I am sure that he would recognize the force of them.

I have had several communications with purchasers of horses for the Canadian Government, more especially with Sir Adam Beck, as to having the British and French Governments come into this country and purchase horses, and I have endeavoured, to the best of my ability, to bring about an arrangement under which that could be done, so that the Canadian owner of horses should have the best possible opportunity to dispose of his animals at a remunerative price. While everything in that connection may not have been perfectly satisfactory in the past, for reasons which I have not fully stated, but to which I have alluded, I am strongly in hopes that in the future the conditions may be improved and that we may give to the Canadian farmer opportunities even more abundant than in the past of disposing of his animals.

Mr. PROULX: Does my right hon. friend think that the department bought directly from the farmers after the appointment of Sir Adam Beck or before? I think since his

appointment they have done so, but not before.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not speaking of the horses for the first contingent. I am not absolutely sure of that, but as soon as it was possible for us to make arrangements, after the strain and hurry and confusion of the early part of the war, the policy was proposed by the Minister of Militia to myself and the other members of the Government that the purchases should be made direct from the farmers. We all acquiesced in that and that policy has been carried out ever since.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The horses bought in Nova Scotia were not bought directly from the farmers. It has been proven in the Public Accounts Committee that middlemen were employed in Nova Scotia and when the middleman had collected a certain number of horses he turned them over to the Government and a cheque was issued to him for a large amount of money to pay for the horses. It does not seem that the money that was paid to the middleman was the same as was paid to the farmer. There is no evidence of that before the committee. The evidence, in fact, is the other way.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend must be alluding to some horses purchased in the early weeks of the war for the first contingent. The purchase of horses in the Maritime Provinces has been under the direction of Sir Adam Beck and has been carried on by persons selected by him. I am quite sure that the arrangement to which I have alluded has been carried out in Nova Scotia as elsewhere.

Mr. OLIVER: This matter is one of very great importance and it is evident that there is a condition whereby the farmers of Canada have not profited by the sale of horses to the extent they might reasonably have expected. The responsibility for this fact seems to be somewhat difficult to fix. Whether it was the policy of the Government of Canada, or whether the Government of Canada was merely carrying out the policy imposed on it by the Imperial Government, does not seem to be altogether clear. I would have understood from the statement of the Premier a few minutes ago that it was the policy of the Government of Canada that other buyers should not buy horses in Canada until the needs of the Canadian Government had been supplied. That was a matter of Canadian policy, not a matter of Imperial policy. Whatever the policy of the Imperial Government which was imposed upon the Government of Canada might be, we are quite willing to accept the judgment of the Imperial Government in that matter, provided due representations were made to the Imperial Government as to the conditions which existed and which were to be met in Canada by the Government of Canada. There being a superabundance of horses in Canada and an underabundance of money, it was desirable that there should be an exchange of horses for money wherever that could be satisactorily accomplished, and it was, I take it, the business of the Government of Canada to place that Canadian situation emphatically before the Imperial authorities, so that it would be only in case the greater and more pressing needs of the Empire had to be met that the Canadian farmer would be forced to hold his horses through an expensive winter, with the probability of not being able to get better prices in the spring. We appreciate the necessity and the propriety of regulations being framed to the end that supplies or materials of any kind that might be of use to an enemy country should not be acquired by that country from Canada by indirect means. To that end regulations have been framed which apply to horses. But why should regulations be framed to apply to horses when such regulations are not framed to apply to nickel, which is just as much a necessity of war as horses, and is not only as much a product of Canada, but is very much more exclusively a product of Canada than are horses. While I do not wish to unduly criticise the Government at this time, I do not think I would be acting fairly by the people whom I represent if I did not say here and now that, as the case has been placed before the House this evening, it does not appear to me that the Government has acted with the consideration towards the interests of the farmers of Canada that might reasonably have been expected.

Mr. BARKER: I wish to say a few words on this subject, because the various gentlemen who have spoken have confused four or five different episodes or occasions. It happens that I was here when a general officer of the British Empire was sent out first in connection with the purchase of horses. I know him very well, he has been many years in the British army, but he is a Canadian born, and I fancy there are thousands of people in this country who know him. The gentleman who opened this argument charged the Government here with some neglect in connection with his visit. The gentleman to whom I refer did

not come out to act for the Canadian Government; he was sent out by the British Government to see how far horses could be procured here for the British army. He went to Toronto, and, as he is a Canadian, he knows all about our part of the country. I was asked by a member of the Government if I would go to Toronto and see this general officer and offer him any assistance I could afford him in the way of directing him to people he should see, or anything of that kind. I did see him. He had opened an office in Toronto, and had a small staff of junior officers with him, and was getting ready to buy horses. He was not asking this Government what he should pay for horses or anything of that kind; he knew all about that, I fancy, a great deal better than this Government or any member of this House. He is a thorough soldier, acquainted with his business. I had an interview with him. He was very thankful to the Government for having asked me to go to him and give him any assistance I could in the way of directions about seeing people, and I had a talk with him. He asked me to come and see him again. I saw him a few days afterwards, but I found that his orders had been countermanded.

They did not ask permission from this Government to countermand the orders, they simply changed their directions, and very much because of some change in the sale of horses in the United States, with which this Government had nothing to do and nothing to say. The gentleman at once found that his object in coming was cancelled, and he went home. If any one wants to know his name I can give it. It is a well-known name in Canada. The gentleman is not in any sense a Canadian officer or a Canadian official, but an officer in the British army. That is all there is to that part of the story, and all the rest of the story has been built on that. The horses that have been spoken of were not the horses that that officer of the British army was sent out to buy. All that came long after he went home.

Mr. OLIVER: We are discussing an item of $550,000—an increase of $150,000 over last year—for the development of the live stock industry. The Government is asking for this large amount of money and for this large increase for the purpose of developing the live stock industry. I do not know how you are going to develop the live stock industry unless you provide a market for the sale of the live stock after it has been produced. What is the use of producing live stock unless you can dispose of it, and dispose of it profitably? I do not wish to criticise the Government unduly, but, since my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has rushed to their rescue so valiantly, let me point out to him that if the British buyer came to Canada to get horses for the British army and afterwards was instructed by the Imperial authorities not to buy horses in Canada, it was certainly up to the Government of Canada to make strong and urgent representations to the Imperial Government that we had for sale in Canada horses that would be suitable for war purposes and which we would be very glad to sell.

Mr. BARKER: Does the hon. gentleman not see that he has overlooked what I have said? Because of what happened in the United States, this officer got instructions from home not to buy horses in Canada. Having received those instructions his duty as an officer of the British army was to go home, and he did so.

Mr. OLIVER: This Government has agents for the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the British Isles, and we have a Department of Agriculture whose business it is to promote the live stock industry. If we have any purpose at all in promoting that industry, surely it was the duty of the Government, with all this multitude of councillors and means of publicity and argument, to represent to the Imperial Government that when they wanted to buy horses Canada certainly had horses that she wanted to sell. Does the hon. member for Hamilton wish us to conclude that the Government of Canada did not make any such representation?

Mr. BARKER: I wish you to conclude that an officer of the British army came out here to buy certain horses. He had orders from home not to buy, and he went home. I cannot say any more than that.

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps the minister could give us some information about federal assistance to the horse breeding industry. I notice that the regulations fix the minimum service fee at not less than $12. Is that a misprint? Should minimum read maximum?

Mr. BURRELL: I will refer to that in a moment. Just before dinner I promised to get some information for the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) in regard to the butter and cheese industries. He asked me if our cheese was sustaining its reputation, and what was the condition

in regard to exports. The report of our Commissioner is that the production is as it was a year ago. The exports of cheese for the nine months ending December, 1914, were 134,108,000 pounds. The home consumption is increasing. Our cheese never stood higher than it does at present. It is in a class by itself, so far as the export trade is concerned. Canadian butter, speaking generally, is improving in quality. Our exports are more than they were a year ago. Up to December, 1914, we exported 2,283,197 pounds, as against 1,011,653 pounds the previous year.

Mr. GRAHAM: An increase of 100 per cent.

Mr. BURRELL: The percentage is very gratifying. Our imports are heavier than our exports, but not quite so heavy as they were the previous year. My hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) asked me a question about the exports of cream. In the nine months ending December, 1914, we exported 1,776,000 gallons. This question is more or less related to the butter question, and my hon. friend will no doubt draw his own conclusions. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) asked me a question about Mr. Giard. Mr. Giard is not exactly the Live Stock Commissioner for Quebec. He is a representative of the Live Stock Branch in the province of Quebec, and performs such duties as are assigned to him by the Live Stock Commissioner at Ottawa. He is principally engaged in the distribution of live stock to associations. He inspects the various associations, and also the animals that have been purchased and sent to them. He has recently been assisting in the organization of our lecture work in connection with the Patriotism-and-Production campaign in the province of Quebec. His headquarters are at Sherbrooke. His salary is $1,800 a year. He has no office, and no assistants. The hon. member for Renfrew also asked me a question about a cold storage company in Brockville. The contract was entered into with the St. Lawrence Produce Company, which has been reorganized and is now known as the Whyte Packing Company. In reply to my hon. friend from Huntingdon, the minimum service fee is not less than $12. I presume that he is familiar with the general scheme as outlined in this little pamphlet.

Mr. ROBB: Yes, I have one of those. My objection is that the Government are practically raising the service fee by $2. I understand that the general fee throughout the country, at all events in our section, is $10 except where there is an extra good horse.

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend's district is much more fortunate than the West as regards really high-class animals.

Mr. ROBB: We produce high-class animals in that part of the country. The objection I have to this is that the Government are giving a preference to the breeding of remounts. They are paying only $4 towards encouraging the breeding of draught horses that will sell anywhere from $200 to $250, while they are paying $4.80 to encourage the breeding of remounts that, as has been proved here to-night, will sell for from $110 to $175. It seems to me that the minister might very well revise that policy.

Mr. BURRELL: I discussed that matter very thoroughly with the Live Stock Commissioner last year and I am perfectly certain that it was after consultation with the men interested in the stimulation of the horse industry throughout the country that this scheme was finally adopted. It is a little on the lines of the English scheme. The 40 per cent for thoroughbred mares was partly a concession to the fact that remounts might be necessary. There was a great deal of criticism, some of it is possibly harsh and some of it possibly deserved, of the system which was in vogue before we took office, and as the feeling of the House seemed to be against it we adopted this modified form of assistance in regard to remounts which, in view of existing circumstances, was warranted. As to the general merits of the scheme I frankly admit that I cannot discuss it as intelligently as I should like to because it is some time since I have had an opportunity of looking into it. It was my earnest desire that the Commissioner of the Live Stock Branch should consult the horse people of the country, to get the best information he could, with the idea of giving that assistance which was most needed and most likely to improve the breed of horses. There may be some demerits, and I shall bear in mind the suggestions of my hon. friend and take them up with the Live Stock Commissioner.

Mr. ROBB: Will the minister explain why a minimum service fee is fixed?

Mr. BURRELL: The chief object of that was to encourage the finest type of sires.

I do not know how it is in Quebec, but I know that in British Columbia, to get anything like a valuable sire, the service would be twenty-five dollars.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the minister any suggestion to offer as to the establishment of a bureau for taking the census of available horses in the country?

Mr. BURRELL: That is done in Great Britain by the War Office, and you can understand how in a small country like England which is not larger territorially than one of our western constituencies, the War Office, with its splendid machinery, can get accurate information. For Canada, so enormous in extent and with divided jurisdiction, there would, I think, be great difficulty in getting an adequate census of the available horses, but I shall have our officers look into it.

Mr. GRAHAM: It might be done through some machinery in the different counties.

Mr. BURRELL: It might.

Mr. GRAHAM: One of the members of the Horse Breeders' Association spent an hour impressing on me the idea of having a bureau for a census of horses, but I got more light to-night on the subject from the few remarks made by the hon. member for Glengarry than ever I had before.

Mr. NEELY: If application is made to the department for a bull, does the department take any steps to see what kind of animal is sent?

Mr. BURRELL: That is left to the association; usually we send whatever breed they ask for.

Mr. NEELY: Is that wise?

Mr. BURRELL: I think so. If we started to dictate to the association what kind of animal should be sent, we would run up against serious criticism.

Mr. NEELY: It should conform to the type of animal in the locality.

Mr. BURRELL: There are a great many localities in which they have not developed along special lines, and usually we send them the particular breed they prefer.

Mr. GRAHAM: Generally speaking, is the quality of horses in Canada improving?

Mr. BURRELL: I think it is.

Mr. GRAHAM: In some parts of Ontario we have a splendid type of horse, while in others there does not seem to be any interest taken in the horse-breeding industry. I remember that some years ago I was interested in exhibitions and I declined to allow prizes to be given in certain classes, for the reason that the judges allowed a horse that was not a carriage horse to be entered in that class because there were no other entries, but the Provincial Government which controls the exhibitions, has restricted that kind of thing in later years. I know two or three of our enterprising horsemen who lost a good deal of money in importing horses in an endeavour to improve the stock, and I look with a good deal of favour on any aid that can be given to bring about a general improvement of the standard of different classes of horses. I am glad to see the Government moving along the line of improving horse-flesh, because I am very fond of a good horse and it is very important that it should be impressed on those who raise horses that it is easier to feed a good horse than a scrub, and a good deal more interesting, because the good horse shows some return for the care you give him. I have been very much interested, having attended some of the gatherings with the minister at different times and listened to the discussions. That is one of the reasons why I referred to the question about the bureau, because I heard it discussed and it impressed itself upon me. As I understand it, we have in Canada—I am speaking more particularly of the province in which I live—different associations. There is the association of breeders of Clydesdales and Percherons, and there are associations of the breeders of the other different standard-bred horses. Have they each a different grant?

Mr. BURRELL: They all belong to the Canadian Live Stock Record.

Mr. GRAHAM: Approximately how much does the horse industry get from the Dominion treasury every year?

Mr. BURRELL: I would not say that offhand, because as a matter of fact we give a lump sum to the Canadian Live Stock Record for the purpose of assisting the Record in keeping the breeds pure.

Mr. NEELY: Does the department do anything in the way of education along the line of this new policy of supplying pure-bred animals; that is to say, does the department contemplate doing anything in the way of sending out men from the department to size up the situation through

Canada generally? How far does the minister propose to go with this policy?

Mr. BURRELL: We have officers who are following up this work in every province. As my hon. friend can understand—and I very much appreciate what he has said in connection with that work—the forming of these associations is an educational work in itself, and by following it up and inspecting the animals and answering continual questions in regard to the policy, we find it is educational work from the top to the bottom. We have such a tremendous response from all parts of the country, especially from the more newly settled portions, that it is pretty hard to keep up with the work.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What proportion of male animals are purchased in the province in which they are distributed?

Mr. BURRELL: I cannot give the figures offhand. I can get it from the Live Stock Branch for the hon. member.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have heard for some time past that a large proportion of the animals distributed in each province is purchased in that province.

Mr. BURRELL: So far as possible we have adopted that principle.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Prices in some provinces are much higher than in others; in fact in the western provinces they are considerably higher than in Ontario or Quebec. From the figures that the minister has just given us, I find that the percentage of male animals distributed throughout the various provinces is not so much in keeping with the requirements of those provinces as I would imagine in view of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the large number of horses that are for sale in Western Canada. I notice that the minister has distributed out of 101 stallions, 25 in the province of Quebec, 49 in the three western provinces, and 6 in the province of Ontario. That would mean nearly 50 per cent in Western Canada as against 6 per cent in the province of Ontario, and the distribution of the other animals is in pretty much the same proportion. There is no doubt that in the older provinces the breeders of pure bred stock went into the business many years ago, and naturally have many more animals for sale than the breeders in the western provinces have. The work that the department is doing along this line is splendid, but in the older provinces, so far as possible, the breeders should be entitled to some consideration, and they should be enabled to sell their stock to improve the stock in the other provinces, in view of the fact that so few pure bred horses are distributed in the province of Ontario, to which I have particular reference.

Mr. BURRELL: I think my hon. friend is quite right, and the policy will work out in that way. We have adopted the principle of trying to encourage the breeders in the various provinces by buying their horses. Where we cannot do so, we generally have to fall back on the province of Ontario, which is so celebrated for its live-stock production. If we buy in the other provinces, it simply means the stimulus of the breeding trade in Ontario, which goes out to the other provinces the more animals that are distributed. I think Ontario will reap some benefit indirectly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Am I correct in stating that the prices in the other provinces are higher than in Ontario?

Mr. BURRELL: I cannot speak positively about that, because I have not the figures.

Arts and Agriculture—to enforce the Seed Act, to test seeds for farmers and seed merchants, to encourage the production and use of superior seeds, and to encourage the production of farm and garden crop, $140,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the increase?

Mr. BURRELL: The amount is practically the same as that of last year, except that there is a little increase in the maintenance of seed laboratories for purity and germination tests. The work is increasing all the time; we are testing a very large number of samples sent from all parts of the country, and it is doing such a tremendous amount of good that we want to increase the strength of our laboratories. Then for seed inspection and enforcement of the Seed Control Act, including salaries and expenses of temporary inspectors, there is an increase from $12,000 to $15,000, and there is also an increase in the subventions to growers of field roots and certain garden seeds. We are doing something in the way of encouraging the production of high class seeds, so that we shall not have to depend so much upon supplies from outside. Otherwise, the work is practically the same. We are carrying on the same system of assistance, giving subventions to seed fairs and so on; that is

giving a proportion of the prize money that is given by the various provinces. We base the subventions on the acreage under crop and the number of fairs held, and we also give supplementary assistance. The subventions have been immensely appreciated by the provinces.

Mr. GRAHAM: The provinces hold the seed exhibitions?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, and we give them the subventions.

Mr. ROBB: Has the minister's attention been drawn to the possibility of a scarcity of small seeds owing to the war in countries from which we have been importing seeds?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, we have been looking into that matter, and it is for that reason a good thing that we have been giving subventions and assistance for the production amongst our own growers of such seeds, and we are getting very encouraging results.

Arts and Agriculture—for the administration and carrying out of the provisions of the Agricultural Instruction Act, $25,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is this?

Mr. BURRELL: This is in connection with the Agricultural Instruction Act, the agreements with all the provinces and the work connected with it or inspection of the agreements and following up the work that is done.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no friction between the Government and the provinces?

Mr. BURRELL: No, the work is going along satisfactorily.

Mr. MORPHY: Would the minister kindly put on Hansard the details relating to the Agricultural Act as applied to Ontario?

Mr. BURRELL: These are the appropriations for the fiscal year 1914-15:

Ontario.

District representatives	$100,000 00
O. A. C. short courses, travelling and living expenses of winners of acre profit and live stock competitions	1,500 00
To encourage agriculture in the public and high schools, to be available for grants and for travelling and living expenses of teachers and others in attendance at short courses or other educational gatherings, in addition to services, expenses and equipment and to be paid out on recommendation of the Department of Education	13,000 00
Educational work in connection with marketing of farm products, including organization of co-operative societies, collection, printing and distribution of information on current prices and systems of marketing	1,000 00
Building at Ontario Agricultural College, including completion of buildings under construction	72,000 00
Stock and seed judging short courses and Institute lecture work	7,500 00
Women's Institute work, including courses in cooking, sewing, etc.	7,500 00
Short courses for fall fair and field crop judges, including travelling and living expenses	1,500 00
Drainage work	4,000 00
Demonstrations and instruction in vegetable growing	2,500 00
Demonstration work on soils	5,000 00
Demonstration work in spraying, pruning and packing of fruits	7,500 00
Demonstrations and instructions on live stock and poultry	4,500 00
Work on bee-keeping	1,000 00
Lectures on horticulture	500 00
Miscellaneous	1,868 83
Total	$230,868 83

Grant to Dominion Exposition, $50,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who gets this $50,000 this year?

Mr. BURRELL: Last year that vote came by rotation to British Columbia. They were advanced one-third of the amount, something less than $17,000. But afterwards the Militia Department took possession of their exhibition building, and on account of the breaking out of the war they found it hopeless to attempt an exhibition. So they asked if I would let it stand over and give them the balance of the money this year. This year, by rights, it would have gone to Nova Scotia—Halifax has put in a strong plea for it. It has been practically arranged, subject to the vote of the House; but there is a little doubt whether British Columbia or Nova Scotia would go on with it this year or next year. I think it will have to depend upon the developments of the war. As the vote is here, I think we had better leave it and see how it works out.

Mr. GRAHAM: What has become of the proposition for a Winnipeg World's exhibition?

Mr. BURRELL: I have not heard anything about that.

Quarantine—salaries and contingencies of organized districts and public health in other districts, $225,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What relation has the medical department to the Conservation Commission? Can the minister tell me what

work the Commission of Conservation is doing in connection with public health?

Mr. BURRELL: I am afraid I cannot. Their work is generally of an investigative kind, with a view to use educationally and in the activities of the several departments. They carried on certain work with illustration farms, but they will drop that, feeling that it is better to leave it with the department. I suppose their medical work has nothing to do with the quarantine, but is rather work of investigation and education.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the Government made up its mind as to the establishment of a health department with a medical man at its head? That has been discussed for a long time. Occasionally we see in the press that changes are to be made in the Cabinet, that a member of the Government is to be shifted to the head of a new health department and another gentleman appointed in his place. The country is anxious about this. Can the minister give us any information?

Mr. BURRELL: Not any definite information. The matter has been under advisement. But, under the pressure of work, which seems to have been the lot of this Administration for the last year or two, these reorganizing matters have been left in abeyance. In Heaven's good time, I suppose, we shall be able to consider the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose we can take it for granted that a gentleman could be found willing to accept the management of that department?

Mr. BURRELL: Possibly.

Mr. GRAHAM: I desire to speak of a matter which was brought forcefully to my attention a few weeks ago. The health of the people, whether conserved by Governments, by commissions or by
10 p.m. their own good common sense, is intimately bound up with the life insurance business. At a recent meeting I attended, one of the most interesting papers I have ever heard was read by a lady. She had entitled that paper "Live a little longer." I have brought it to the attention of the Commission of Conservation, and I think the ideas put forward in that paper are worthy of consideration by the Government. The young lady who read the paper is from Berlin, Ont., and is now a resident of Rochester. In that city, it seems, they have adopted the plan of having instruction given periodically—I think once a week—to all classes, not only to young people, but adults as well, in the treatment of sudden illness until the physician can be summoned; how to prevent certain diseases, and generally how to care for health. These lectures are given by qualified physicians and nurses, and practical illustrations are given of attending to patients.

Mr. BURRELL: The St. John Ambulance Association is doing work of the same kind, and we give them a vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, they work along that line. In Rochester, this instruction is very general. In this propagandist movement they use the school buildings, which are unused half the time, and could be put to no better use. The results, as indicated by the paper to which I have referred, are very marked. The people in all sections of that city, the poor as well as the wealthy, are taking an interest in the work. While the results do not interfere in any way with professional practice, a knowledge is cultivated among ordinary people of how to treat diseases, from some of which the patents would die if they were left without this attention.

I would advise the Government to get in touch with that organization in Rochester and see if this test could not be made in some of our large or even in some of our smaller centres. Thousands die in this and every other country through absolute ignorance of how to treat disease in its first stages, or before a physician can be secured.

Quarantine—Tracadie and D'Arcy island lazaretto, and leprosy generally, $11,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: How many physicians have you there?

Mr. BURRELL: At Tracadie, only one. At D'Arcy island, we have only a caretaker.

Quarantine—Public Works Health Act.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the Public Works Health Act?

Mr. BURRELL: It is in connection with the sanitary condition of railway camps, and so on. We have two inspectors, and there is provision for another if the railway situation advises a readjustment.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who are the inspectors?

Mr. BURRELL: Dr. Clendenan in the West and Dr. Fisher in the East.

Arts and Agriculture—health of animals—further amount required, $65,000.

Mr. BURRELL: This was necessitated by the unusual and very large expenditure

which was made chiefly in connection with the outbreak of hog cholera, and partly in connection with durine. There were serious outbreaks of hog cholera with which we had to deal, the expenditures are covered by this supplementary vote.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the valuation upon which remuneration is paid in respect of hogs?

Mr. BURRELL: $15 is the maximum valuation for ordinary hogs; upon that valuation two-thirds is paid, $10.

Arts and Agriculture—to provide a further amount for the administration and enforcement of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act, Governor General's warrant, $20,000.

Mr. BURRELL: Upon the declaration of the embargo by the United States it was absolutely necessary that we should appoint inspectors to see that their requirements were complied with. We had no provision in the Estimates for this, and we had to proceed by Governor General's warrant.

Arts and Agriculture, exhibitions—further amount required, $30,000.

Mr. BURRELL: I move that this item be struck out. The amount is unnecessary, and we can get along very well without it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has any decision been reached as to where the next Dominion exhibition shall be held?

Mr. BURRELL: I have already answered that question by pointing out that the matter as it now stands was left for the purpose of giving the exhibition to British Columbia. British Columbia had it last year, but owing to the fact that the Militia Department took over their buildings after the war broke out, they did not hold it. The understanding is that they may hold it this year, and Nova Scotia will get it the following year. If British Columbia does not hold it this year, they will hold it next year, and Halifax will get it the year following.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think representations have been made by the Halifax Board of Trade that the holding of the exhibition in Nova Scotia should be postponed until 1916.

Motion agreed to, and item struck out.

Legislation—House of Commons—salaries, etc., $490,662.50.

Mr. SPEAKER: I move that this resolution be amended by reducing the amount of the second item—salaries—from $209,350 to $207,350, and by inserting after the words "Serjeant-at-Arms" in the last item —Estimates of the Serjeant-at-Arms—the words: "including salary of Stanley S. Spencer at $700."

Mr. GRAHAM: Is the item large enough to cover that amount?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose the attention of many hon. gentlemen has been called to the fact that for attendance at the August session of Parliament some of the employees of the House of Commons, chiefly messengers, received a per diem allowance as usual, but the total amount received was comparatively so small that in some cases, I understand, after paying disbursements for travelling expenses, these employees returned home out of pocket. I have not made any particular investigation into the matter, but it has been called to my attention by two or three persons on behalf of these employees.

I daresay it has also been called to the attention of Mr. Speaker. I am inclined to think that if the facts are as I state them, some little consideration should be given to their request, because if their disbursements exceeded the payment received for the August session it would be only fair that some allowance should be made. It may be quite true that some members of the House of Commons suffered in the same way in that session, but, of course, there is no objection on the part of hon. gentlemen. I mention this particularly to inquire of the Speaker if any request has been made to him concerning this matter and what his decision was.

Mr. SPEAKER: An application was made by the sessional employees of the House on the understanding that the session would only last for about two months. Their claim was that the amount received when the travelling and other expenses were deducted would leave a very small balance coming to them. As it was not known at that time how long the House would sit, it was thought well to defer decision for some time until we would have better knowledge of the duration of the session. I submitted their request to the Internal Economy Commission and after looking into it carefully it was decided that it could not be taken up and their request granted. To grant their request at the time would have in-

volved a very considerable expenditure. The daily payment to the sessional staff is $627.24. They desired to be paid for 100 days whether the session lasted that long or not. If the session lasted 100 days they would not ask any additional payment, but they did ask that 100 days should be the minimum. That would call for an expenditure of $62,724 for the session. Up to April 1, the session had lasted 56 days. That would give them $35,125, and the balance to make up the 100 days would be $27,598. The commission thought, in view of the fact that if this was taken up and the request granted it would certainly result in a great many more applications being made to deal with other employees, it would not be well to grant the request at that stage of the session, if done at all. Of course it was not then known how long the session would last. It has already lasted some days past the 1st of April, and we do not know just when it will close. The decision was that the request could not be entertained, although it was admitted that many of the employees would have very little over their expenses, providing the session closed about the 1st of April.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I intended to say that my remarks would also apply to the Hansard amanuenses. There may be some objection to making an extra allowance calculating on the basis of a session of 100 days. That might be a bad precedent to establish. I should think that some allowance might have been made in connection with the August session at least.

Mr. SPEAKER: This included the debates amanuenses, 9 at $5 a day; 19 sessional clerks at $5 a day and 16 at $4 a day; four committee amanuenses at $5 a day; the stenographers, doorkeepers, bookkeepers, servants and charwomen. Of course if it is the wish of the House to grant their request or any portion of it we would have to do so.

Mr. MARCIL: How were the Hansard staff and translators paid for the August session?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hansard staff and translators are paid by the year.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: The clerks who came here for the August session in some cases had to travel quite long distances and some of them did not receive enough to pay their expenses. I would suggest that they be remunerated in some way for that short session. The clerks who came from northern Ontario and from the Maritime Provinces were out of pocket. A Maritime Province clerk would have to pay railway fare and expenses of $25 or $30 and receiving $4 a day for seven days he would get $28. The messengers who would have the same expenses received only $22.75 for the seven days. They lost their time and were some of them out of pocket. I would suggest that something be done for these men. Those who receive higher wages perhaps need not receive the same consideration as these men on small salaries. I would also suggest that as this is a short session they should be granted remuneration for at least 100 days.

Mr. SPEAKER: With reference to the short session, knowing it was likely to be a very short session, I instructed those whose duty it was to notify the employees that we were likely to have a short session and that it was optional with them to come or not, so they were not exactly taken unawares. Of course, if anything was done it could not be done by enlarging this vote as we have not power to do that; but it might be paid in another way.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not think it would be advisable to fix a certain number of days like 100; but I do think, in all fairness, that some consideration should be given to these men for their services during the short session in August. It does not seem to be dealing squarely with men to ask them to come down here when we need their services and pay them less than it costs them to come here. I think the country is big enough to at least give them something for their services over and above their expenses. Some consideration should be given to these officials for the session in August.

Mr. McCRANEY: What is the practice with regard to the employment of messengers and members of the sessional staff? I gather from the remarks of the hon. member from Prince Edward Island that members of the staff are selected from points distant from the capital and that this is largely a grievance over travelling expenses. When I came down in August I was surprised, having in view the fact that we were to have a session of five or six days only, that the House was as fully manned as it was. As there was a great deal of expense going on I wondered if there was anything to justify their being here for such a short session. Perhaps the Speaker can tell us whether the whole staff was on at the opening of the session in August.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think they were all here with the exception of two or three. The

great bulk of the staff are located within a reasonable distance of Ottawa, but some come from Prince Edward Island, and others from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or the West.

Mr. ROGERS: There is a great deal of reason in what has been said as to the small amount paid to the officers of the House during the short session we had in August. Of course we cannot very well correct that matter at the present moment, but I am sure that no member of the House would desire to see the staff come here and go home out of pocket, whether the session was long or short. I have never heard any complaint myself, but perhaps some other members of the Government have. I will bring it to the attention of the Government, and if anything can be done we shall be glad to do it.

Legislation—Library of Parliament—salaries, $33,850.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to move that this item of $33,850 be reduced to $31,550. There is one position that we did not think it necessary to fill, and I thought it would only be a temptation to leave the amount there.

Motion agreed to.

Legislation—general—contingent expenses in connection with the voters' lists, $6,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What does it cost to print the voters' lists for the whole of Canada?

Mr. ROGERS: I have no idea; it is not connected with my department.

Mr. MACLEAN: Perhaps the minister can tell us when it is expected that the next voters' lists will be used?

Mr. ROGERS: It takes a very long time to print the lists.

Mr. PROULX: I have been told that at the Printing Bureau they are working day and night on the voters' lists. They worked until midnight last Saturday.

Mr. ROGERS: This is the first time I have heard of it.

Public Works—harbours and rivers, N.S.—Jamesville—to complete breakwater, $3,400.

Mr. MACKENZIE: How much work has been done on that breakwater?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is for repairs, and to complete the work.

Mr. McKENZIE: It would not be for repairs, because the work is new, I understand.

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is asked for by the district engineer to complete the construction of the breakwater commenced last year. The works when completed will consist of an isolated crib-work breakwater with creosoted timber substructure, 170 feet long and 16 feet wide, connected with shore by a creosoted timber pile approach 152 feet in length. The chief engineer informs me that this is not for repairs, but to complete the work.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is in my riding, but I was not aware that the work had been commenced at all.

Mr. ROGERS: The chief engineer informs me that it has.

Mr. McKENZIE: By tender and contract?

Mr. ROGERS: The chief engineer says no.

Mr. McKENZIE: What was the cost?

Mr. ROGERS: $1,800 has been spent, and we are asking for $3,400 to complete the work.

Mr. McKENZIE: Was it during last winter that this work was being done? I am always on the alert if anything is being done in my riding, but I never heard anything about this.

Mr. ROGERS: The chief engineer says that the work was done in 1914-15. I shall be glad to get any particulars that my hon. friend wants.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the size of the breakwater?

Mr. ROGERS: 115 feet long and 16 feet wide, connected with the shore by timber piles 152 feet in length.

Mr. McKENZIE: What depth of water?

Mr. ROGERS: I have no information as to that.

Mr. McKENZIE: Who has charge of the construction?

Mr. ROGERS: I cannot give that information at the moment.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister bring down information as to who had charge of the work, the number of days occupied in it, the material used, and generally speaking, how it was constructed?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: It looks as if there had been nothing done with regard to a number of these works for which we are now voting money.

Mr. ROGERS: These votes are almost entirely re-votes and they are for works we were not able to undertake before August last. There is really nothing new in these Estimates that has not been passed upon by the House before. What items are in for repairs and maintenance have all been inserted on the recommendation of the district engineers.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose all these works will be done this year?

Mr. ROGERS: We will undertake as many of them as we can.

Lunenburg harbour improvements, $35,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose this is for dredging?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: Have tenders been asked for?

Mr. ROGERS: Not up to date.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If the minister decides to go on with the work will he ask for tenders?

Mr. ROGERS: Certainly.

Mill Cove—extension of breakwater, $10,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will tenders be asked for this work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, for everything over $5,000.

McKay's Point—repairs to wharf, $900.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is McKay's point in my county, is this work to be done there?

Mr. ROGERS: It is in Cape Breton North.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is this vote for?

Mr. ROGERS: The covering of the wharf is in such a dangerous condition that teams dare not go on it, and this vote is for repairs.

North West Cove (Tancook island, breakwater), $42,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is this vote to replace the old breakwater which has been in existence there for a long time?

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. The timber was asked for last year. Tenders were called for on August 17, 1914, and three tenders were received.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why was a contract not awarded?

Mr. ROGERS: The tenders were called for on the 17th of August, and we did not award the contract.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will it be awarded now?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know. The work does not seem to have been pressed very much since that time. If we can get out of doing it, we will.

Mr. MACLEAN: Was any objection made to award the contract to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. ROGERS: None whatever. We invariably award the contract to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is this a new work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. It is not new in the Estimates this year.

Plaster mines wharf, $1,500.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is Plaster Mines in North Cape Breton?

Mr. ROGERS: In Victoria county.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the estimated cost of the wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: $7,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Have you called for tenders?

Mr. ROGERS: Not yet. We will call for tenders.

Porter's lake—boat channel to Three Fathoms harbour, $10,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will this money be expended this year?

Mr. ROGERS: We shall have to spend something for the re-opening of the outlet.

South bay, Ingonish, to complete wharf extension, $2,500.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is a very important piece of work, and I wish to call the minister's attention to it. The $2,500 that he has in the Estimates is not going to be of much service. The wharf was put in the wrong place. It is so short that steamers cannot come alongside at all, and the water is so deep that, if the department is going to extend the wharf, it will find it an extremely expensive matter. This $2,500 will be a

mere drop in the bucket for any useful extension of a wharf at that place. The hon. minister will find the early history in the department that the wharf that should have been utilized was known as the Corson wharf, and in 1911 there was money in the Estimates to buy that wharf and to put it into first-class shape. Instead of that—I do not know on whose advice—the department built this wharf on a rocky bar where it is almost impossible to haul anything to or from it. The Corson wharf, which was the one formerly in use, should have been bought. Mr. Corson, who is a wealthy American living in that part of the country, built this wharf for himself; he built a good road to it, and he is willing to sell the wharf to the Government for what it cost him. He is not looking for any profit, and his price will be found most reasonable. Any one who has seen Corson wharf will say it is pretty cheap at the price he is asking for it, and it would be better to abandon what has been done on the old wharf and buy this one.

Mr. ROGERS: I am not familiar with the earlier history of the conditions and of the wharf to which my hon. friend refers. I have before me only the information in respect to this particular vote with which my hon. friend is apparently familiar. I am not in a position to say whether his judgment is better than that of the engineer who made the recommendation or not, but I shall have the matter looked into and see what can be done.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am anxious that the people should have the best service that the money can afford, and that the Government should have the best possible value for its expenditure; and as one who is very familiar with the conditions and who was aboard the steamer several times when she attempted to come to this wharf, I am afraid it would be a very expensive piece of business to try to make a proper wharf at the place where a start has been made, whereas Mr. Corson's wharf is a first-class one and cheap at the price asked.

Tracadie harbour improvements, $12,300.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Apparently there has been some expenditure; what is the state of the work now?

Mr. ROGERS: There has been a very small expenditure for emergency repairs.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This item has stood for a long time, I understand. It has been there ever since the by-election in Antigonish, two or three years ago. It is time that something should be done. Does the minister purpose spending the money during the present season?

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be glad to take the advice of my hon. friend and endeavour to advance the work if I possibly can.

Yarmouth harbour—improvements, $82,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is this for dredging?

Mr. ROGERS: It is to provide a better entrance to the harbour, to remove obstructions, and also for an extension of the breakwater and dredging.

Mr. MACLEAN: This vote was in last year. Was any work done last season?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not see here any memorandum of what was done last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: We voted $87,000 last year. It would seem that $5,000 was expended.

Mr. ROGERS: That is probably what we expected to spend when the Estimates were made, but the chief engineer tells me that it was not expended.

Mr. MACLEAN: No expenditure made last year?

Mr. ROGERS: Apparently not.

Mr. MACLEAN: Were tenders asked for?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. MACLEAN: Why not?

Mr. ROGERS: This sum was only voted in June, and we did not get to it.

Mr. MACLEAN: That does not seem a sufficient excuse for not proceeding with the work. I am sorry the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Law) is not present.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sure that if that hon. gentleman were present he would not complain very much, for we have spent a large sum on Yarmouth harbour.

Mr. MACLEAN: I think that if the hon. member were here he would complain, and justly, of the failure of the department to proceed with the expenditure last year to some extent at least. Yarmouth is a very important harbour and shipping point. A line of steamers plies between Boston and Yarmouth, and from Yarmouth a great deal of trade is carried on between Nova Scotia and American ports. It is also the route

of a great deal of summer tourist travel. It is a tidal harbour, and to my own knowledge it requires a great deal of work. The money having been voted, I submit that the department should proceed with the work. At least tenders might have been
11 p.m. called for, so that the contractor would have been ready to proceed with the work this spring. Does the minister propose asking for tenders?

Mr. ROGERS: We have spent a good deal of money in Yarmouth harbour. In 1911-12, we spent $60,000; in 1912-13, $33,000. There is no doubt that this is a harbour that will entail a heavy expenditure yet before it is completed. We have spent a good deal in addition in dredging. As my hon. friend has stated, this is a very important harbour, and the Government are disposed to make an expenditure there at the earliest possible moment, because of the present necessity of work of that kind as shown by the amount that is asked for.

Mr. MACLEAN: I understand that the department will proceed to ask for tenders?

Mr. ROGERS: As soon as possible.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Before we pass from the Nova Scotia items, I want to call the attention of the minister to the necessity of making some repairs on the public wharf at Country Harbour. That wharf is in a dilapidated state and should be repaired. It is a wharf of considerable importance, and I do not think the costs of the repairs would be very great. No doubt the engineer has the information in his office. If the minister will make a note of it and see that attention is paid to it, I shall be much obliged.

Mr. ROGERS: I will make a note of it.

Public Works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers, P.E.I.—Brudenell, wharf reconstruction, $4,500.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: What does reconstruction mean in this case?

Mr. ROGERS: The old wharf at Brudenell, which is the only wharf in the vicinity, has become impassable, and reconstruction is desired.

Mr. HUGHES: By whom was the old wharf owned?

Mr. ROGERS: This wharf, which was built many years ago, is owned by the local Government. It is 305 feet long, with an approach twenty feet wide and a pier head of thirty feet. Its rebuilding will give shipping facilities to a rich agricultural district of about two hundred inhabitants.

Mr. HUGHES: What depth of water is there at that wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid I cannot supply that information. The site of the old wharf is near the head of navigation of the Brudenell river, three and a half miles west of Georgetown and two miles southward from the Cardigan station and the Georgetown branch line of the Prince Edward Island railway.

Mr. HUGHES: Is it intended to proceed with the work this coming summer?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: My information is that there is not enough water there to accommodate vessels. Has the minister any information to that effect?

Mr. ROGERS: There may be information in the department; I will make a note of it.

Charlottetown harbour, $28,000.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: How is that amount to be expended?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is required to complete the dredging under contract in connection with the construction of a marine slip in Charlottetown harbour near Southport. The slip is required for the accommodation of the class of vessels frequenting the waters in the vicinity of this harbour, and of the ships of the Marine Department and of the Dominion Government. The capacity of the proposed slip will be 3,000 tons, and it will accommodate vessels 350 feet long.

North lake—boat harbour, $24,000.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: This item has been voted every year since the present Government came into power. What is the object of voting it every year and not doing anything with the money?

Mr. ROGERS: We are practising economy, on the advice of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. HUGHES: That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: I think I can answer the question. The reason is that the hon. member for Kings opposes the expenditure. He has got his friends to claim that their land will be over-run by water if this breakwater is constructed. I do not think there is any valid reason for

the objection of the hon. member or the contention of his friends. If this breakwater is built, it will be a great benefit to the fishermen in my hon. friend's constituency, and the only reason for its not being built is perverseness on the part of my hon. friend and his friends because the Conservative Government is giving this great boon to the people on the north side of the island, who have no other harbour in that vicinity for shelter. That is the reason given to me even by some friends of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The hon. gentleman's imagination is very strong; he is at sea, without rudder or compass. Surely he knows that I have not enough influence with this Government to prevent them from doing a good thing if they were determined to do it. Any person who gave information of that kind to my hon. friend was simply playing with him. I never opposed this project. I am quite in favour of having a boat harbour on that part of the coast, and I realize that it would be a very great advantage to the fishermen of that part of our province. That is the reason why I am asking the Government why they have this vote in the Estimates from year to year and still do not proceed to expend it. I do not like to see the Government fool the people in that part of the country, and I should like to have a definite statement from the minister as to what he intends to do during the coming summer. The hon. member for Queens need not be afraid of any opposition on my part; I will not oppose the construction of a boat harbour there if the Government intends to go ahead with the the work, but I do not like to see the Government pretend that they are going to do something when really they have no intention of doing it.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend is very much mistaken in saying that the Government are trying to fool the people. If there is any cause for delay, the responsibility rests upon the people themselves. We have endeavoured to get the title to the necessary land for this work; it has been impossible to get it, and the engineers of the department recommend that we should not start the work until we secure a proper title. If my hon. friend can help us to get that title we are prepared to go on with the work at any time. If there has been delay, it is chargeable to the people of the vicinity where this work is to be carried on, not to the Government.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The minister is either not familiar with conditions in that part of the country, or he has been misinformed, because there is no question of a title to this land at all. If a boat harbour were constructed, it would be on land that belongs to the Crown. The minister has made a statement not in accordance with the facts. The facts are that some persons in the neighbourhood were under the impression that their farms might be affected by the construction of this boat harbour, and the Department of Public Works sent an emissary to these people to get them to sign a document that if their lands were injured they would not ask the department for any compensation. The minister told me that himseslf last year, and consequently I am on firm ground in making that statement. I venture the assertion that such a proposition was never made to any persons in Canada before, the private individual whose land might be injured by the construction of a public work asked to sign a document that in the event of his property being injured he would not ask for compensation, thus ruling himself out of court. The department must surely have known that nobody in his senses would sign such a document as that. The people refused, as anybody would have done under similar circumstances. That is the title to the land on which the minister is a little astray. So far as the boat harbour itself is concerned, there is no title in question, as the place where the harbour would be constructed belongs to the Crown and the question of title could not arise. I had nothing to do with that, notwithstanding the statement of my hon. friend from Queens county (Mr. McLean). I want to know the facts in connection with the matter.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: I think my hon. friend knows very well that this boat harbour would have been built a year ago, or would have been commenced, if he himself had not deliberately put his political friends up to claiming damages.

Mr. HUGHES: I must emphatically contradict that statement; there is not a word of truth in it. It is absolutely untrue, absolutely, and I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it.

Mr. McLEAN: I will not withdraw a statement which is correct.

Mr. HUGHES: I say the statement is absolutely untrue.

Mr. McLEAN: The hon. gentleman himself a few days ago in this House charged against Mr. J. D. Hegan, a gentleman who was engineer—

Mr. HUGHES: That is getting away from the facts, this is another thing.

Mr. McLEAN: No, I am not getting away from it.

Mr. HUGHES: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has made the statement that I went to my political friends and asked them to make a claim for damages in connection with this work and to object to the construction of it. That statement is absolutely untrue, absolutely, there is not one word of truth in it.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think my hon. friend is quoting the words of my hon. friend from Queens county correctly. I do not think he made the statement that the hon. member went to his political friends to get them to make a claim.

Mr. HUGHES: What statement did he make?

Mr. ROGERS: He said the friends of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES: The friends? Even that statement is not true.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: The hon. gentleman is very apt to make statements of the character of that which he has just made, that statements are not true. The other night in this House he made a statement that the consulting engineer, Mr. J. B. Hegan, was dismissed and superannuated by this Government.

Mr. HUGHES: No, I did not.

Mr. McLEAN: It is in Hansard and I can read it to the House. As a matter of fact Mr. Hegan was never superannuated. He made the statement further that Mr. Hegan was approached by Liberal Conservatives in Prince Edward Island and that he was forced out of his office, that he was approached for graft on contracts. I want to tell the hon. gentleman and the committee that that statement has no foundation whatever in fact. Mr. Hegan was never approached by any person. Any one would be led to believe from the hon. gentleman's statement that Mr. Hegan had informed the hon. member that he had been so approached, that Mr. Hegan states emphatically that he never made such a statement to the hon. gentleman, and that his statement in this House is absolutely untrue and false, and I have in my hand an affidavit made by Mr. Hegan to that effect.

Mr. McKENZIE: I rise to a point of order. We had a very explicit ruling from the Chairman of this committee that discussions in committee must be germane to the matter before the committee. We might as well know whether these rulings are to be observed or not. The vote before the House has nothing to do with whether a certain gentleman was superannuated or not.

Mr. McLEAN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton is just as big a transgressor as any man in this House. He should be the last man to make the statement he has just made because he is always transgressing the rule, if such a rule exists. I am going to read Mr. Hegan's affidavit.

Mr. McKENZIE: I want the ruling of the Chair. I take the point of order that the discussion, according to the ruling of the Chair, must be germane to the vote under consideration. It is well within the memory of every man in this House that the hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) who had the floor was called to order by the Chair and this ruling was announced, that the discussion must be germane to the question before the Chair. If the Chairman will say that is not the rule and that a member can switch off to anything he thinks proper, let us understand it that way; but if the ruling is to be observed, I submit that the hon. member at this moment cannot speak upon the subject that he is bringing up.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I think it is well understood by the committee and by all members that the item under discussion must be spoken to, and I am sure the hon. member will abide by that rule.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: The only thing I can do under the circumstances, as a charge of graft was made against an official of this country, which the official denies, is to take another opportunity to place the matter before the House to show that the statements made by the hon. member for Kings are not always correct.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: In justice to myself I state most emphatically that I never made any charge against Mr. Hegan, an official of the Public Works Department, never at any time.

Mr. McLEAN: It is in Hansard.

Mr. HUGHES: Does the minister intend to proceed with the work during the coming summer?

Mr. ROGERS: As soon as we get this famous question of damages settled we will be glad to go on, but we cannot go on until it is settled.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Can you not expropriate?

Mr. ROGERS: We could not expropriate on the question of damages.

Mr. HUGHES: The title is not under consideration at all. Does the minister expect that it would be reasonable to ask men owning property that might be injured by the construction of a work, to sign a document in advance that if their property was injured they would not ask for any compensation? Has that ever been done under similar circumstances in the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. ROGERS: It has been done very, very frequently in the Public Works Department, in various portions of Canada; and I can say further that unless we can get a favourable arrangement with the people there we cannot go on with the work. But the moment we do get a favourable arrangement we will be glad to go on immediately.

Mr. HUGHES: That is equivalent to saying that unless the men in the neighbourhood who own land sign a document of that character you will not proceed with the work?

Mr. ROGERS: There are a large number of people there who have already agreed to the conditions which have been imposed, and simply a few are holding out with a view to blocking the work, as I understand it.

Mr. HUGHES: There would not be a large number affected. A man who owned property that could not by any possibility be affected would of course sign a document of that kind, because there would be no danger to him in signing it. I repeat it is most unreasonable to ask these people to sign an agreement of that character. It has certainly never been done before in our province. The object is of course apparent.

Mr. ROGERS: I understand they have all signed but two.

Mr. HUGHES: These two might be the ones whose property would be most affected. It is most unjust to ask these men to sign a document of that kind.

Public Works—harbours and rivers, P.E.I.—Souris—extension of breakwater, $40,000.

Mr. ROGERS: I beg to move that this item be reduced to $6,000. The contract is completed, and $6,000 is all that is required.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Will any repairs be necessary to the work during the coming summer?

Mr. ROGERS: We have of course the general vote, out of which we could make any necessary repairs.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Was there not some dispute about injuries to the breakwater last fall?

Mr. ROGERS: There was some difficulty, but it had been settled.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Before we pass this item I should like to ask the minister if any extension or repairs will be made to Little Sand breakwater this year. I do not see any item for that purpose.

Mr. ROGERS: We have nothing in the Estimates for it.

Mr. HUGHES: I have information here to the effect that when the breakwater was built at that place a space was left between the breakwater and the shore, and that the contractor or somebody else put a little clay on the rocks in order to bring them level with the breakwater. The next high tide, or certainly the next storm, washed the clay away. I should like to know if the end of the breakwater was really built in this flimsy way, and if any steps will be taken during the coming summer to complete the breakwater.

Mr. ROGERS: I have nothing before me to supply the information my hon. friend asks for. We shall have a sufficient amount in the general vote to make any repairs that are necessary.

Public Works—harbours and rivers, N.B.—Bathurst—harbour improvements, $100,000.

Mr. TURGEON: Is this to be done by contract?

Mr. ROGERS: An Order in Council was passed on October 23, 1914, recommending that authority be given to arrange with the Northern Dredging and Construction Company, Limited, for the dredging during the balance of the season of 1914, of a quantity of 100,000 cubic yards, place measure, at 30 cents per cubic yard, meaning an over-expenditure of $30,000 of the appropriation of

$100,000; the company to wait for payment of this work until Parliament shall have granted an additional appropriation at its next session.

Campbellton—deep water wharf accommodation, $50,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is this for?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is required for widening and extending deep water wharves and dredging berths at Campbellton. The proposed extension will be 600 feet long and 55 feet wide, built on a foundation dredged to 25 feet at L.W.O.S.T. In addition the present wharves are to be widened to 55 feet by the construction of a cribwork, 20 feet wide, for a length of 883 feet along the inner face.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the work under way?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. MARCIL: Will it be proceeded with this year?

Mr. ROGERS: I am not sure. During the present year some repairs will be necessary. Campbellton, which is now the second largest shipping port of New Brunswick, shipped in 1913, 54,351,943 feet of lumber. It is a divisional point on the Intercolonial railway and the terminus of the International railway. In addition to the lumber shipments a large business is done in coal, and there is considerable traffic with points in Bonaventure and Gaspé counties, Que., a steamer making bi-weekly trips on this route. The present deep water wharves have a length on the outer face of 1,188 feet. The approach is about 175 feet in average width and 350 feet long. The Shives wharf was purchased in 1902-3 and forms part of the deep water wharf. The total expenditure to March 31, 1914, was $287,169.36.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand that $287,000 has been spent, and that $280,000 is to be expended.

Mr. ROGERS: That estimate covers a period of years.

Dalhousie—repairs to deep water wharf, $2,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What amount has been expended up to date?

Mr. ROGERS: $53,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it intended to do any dredging this year on the Restigouche river between Dalhousie and Campbellton?

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. ROGERS: We have a general dredging vote. Is there necessity for dredging there?

Mr. MARCIL: There has been dredging done in the past, and if half a million dollars is to be expended for a wharf at Campbellton, you will have to dredge to enable the boats to reach it.

Green Point (Beresford)—breakwater, $10,000.

Mr. TURGEON: This amount has been voted and re-voted since 1911, and last year the minister promised me the work would be done. Until then I placed the onus on the shoulders of the Minister of Marine, because I thought he was interfering. May I expect to have that work done this year?

Mr. ROGERS: It is like a number of other works that we have not been able to carry on during the past year, but we hope for better things this season.

Mr. TURGEON: When does the minister intend to have this work done?

Mr. ROGERS: As soon as we possibly can.

Mr. TURGEON: When will that be?

Mr. ROGERS: I would not like to be definite about it.

River St. John and tributaries—construction of wharves in tidal waters, $34,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This seems to be an irregular way of wording a vote. You could build several wharves, not costing more than $5,000 each, over nearly a hundred miles, under this wording.

Mr. ROGERS: We have been following the wording of this particular vote for a number of years.

Mr. MACLEAN: It does not look right.

Mr. ROGERS: It does not.

Tracadie—to construct breakwater and breastworks, $5,000.

Mr. TURGEON: This vote has been in the Estimates for the last three or four years. Does the minister intend to do any work this year?

Mr. ROGERS: The amount of the estimate is very small compared with the importance of the work, and until we can ask Parliament to vote a much larger sum it is difficult for me to assure my hon. friend that we can go on with the work. The estimate for this work is $70,000.

Mr. TURGEON: I admit that the amount in the Estimates is very small, but I expected it would be larger and that the work would be commenced.

Sackville—approach to new wharf, $800.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) urged on the Minister of Railways the building of this approach to the wharf at Sackville. It seems to be an urgent work for the Sackville people, as they cannot get to the wharf unless it is built, and I would ask the minister if he intends to proceed with it this year?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount will provide the approach to the wharf, and that will be done immediately.

Batiscan—wharf, $3,000.

Mr. BUREAU: There was $18,000 voted last year; will this vote finish the work?

Mr. ROGERS: There apparently is some error in the amount named here.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the proper amount?

Mr. ROGERS: It will require $8,000 more to complete the work.

Bersimis—wharf, $2,000.

Mr. SEGUIN (Translation): Mr. Chairman, in the Estimates now before the House, both for the province of Quebec and for the other provinces, there appear a number of items for the construction of wharves, from which I conclude that the Government's policy is not antagonistic to the building of wharves in this country, and by which is deepened my regret at the minister's omitting to include in the Estimates of this session the amount necessary for the construction of a wharf at L'Assomption. I am not raising a new question. As early as 1911, the late Government had had plans prepared and had provided for this work, which is indispensable not only to the town of L'Assomption, but also to that whole district. The necessary amount was to be found in the Estimates of 1911-12 and 1912-13; but later was cut off, and the legitimate demands of L'Assomption were denied. The work had been started under the late Government, and a quantity of material had been brought on the ground; but with the coming into power of the present administration the work was discontinued notwithstanding that the money was again voted in 1912-13, and the material is still on the shore where it is going to waste. The other day, when I advocated in this House the right of the town of St. Lin to a post office and taunted the minister for his indifference in the matter, the reply came, quite undeserved, that possibly I had not pressed my request sufficiently. In this particular case of a wharf for L'Assomption, I did repeatedly call the attention of the minister to it, and I know that representations have come to the Government from more welcome sources; I deem it my duty to warn the minister and this House that the Government's best friends at L'Assomption are disappointed to find that their claims have been heeded so very little by him. Joseph Edouard Faribault, K.C., perhaps the most prominent Conservative at L'Assomption, urged his leaders to action, but, only a few days ago, he confessed to me his vexation at having had to go a-begging to the dispensers of government patronage with no better result.

It is no matter of great surprise to me that the minister should show preferences to and be more favourably inclined towards his Tory supporters; but how comes it that he is so callous to the requests of his best friends at L'Assomption. All good movements for the betterment of conditions in my county find in me a staunch supporter; and the minister may feel sure that, unless he heed the claims of his good friends of L'Assomption, I shall not fail to take advantage of his indifference, and I shall succeed in proving to those good people that they need not expect fair dealing at the hands of the present Administration. Be fair towards all the citizens of the town of L'Assomption and of that whole section and, more especially, listen to your best friends, if you do not want to provoke their just resentment.

In taking my seat, I would ask the minister if he intends to carry on this work?

Mr. ROGERS: I am very pleased to know that my hon. friend notes with such satisfaction the large sums of money we are spending in the various public works that we are undertaking in the different counties of the province of Quebec. I regret that he apparently is not satisfied with the amount being spent in the county of L'Assomption.

Mr. MARCIL: He complains that the item has been struck out altogether.

Mr. ROGERS: It is true that in 1910-11 a small item was put in the Estimates and some little work was done by day labour just immediately previous to the election of that year, and it is evident that that

work has not been considered of such a pressing necessity as to warrant the Government in going on with that particular wharf. There is a certain reason why a wharf should be built at the point named by my hon. friend, but I think he will agree with me that there is no very pressing necessity for that particular piece of work.

I do not suppose it will be necessary to go into the details of the public buildings in so far as the river improvements on the wharf in the constituency of L'Assomption to which my hon. friend has referred; but I can assure my hon. friend that we will give it that consideration that its importance deserves, and while we have no amount in the Estimates this year, let us hope that we shall have to put one in next year, if the conditions demand it.

Mr. SEGUIN (Translation): I must acknowledge to the minister that he shows some willingness for the future. However, I must report that this work is of more immediate import than, judging from his statements, he seems to think. This wharf is urgently needed, and in this year's Estimates I see that many small towns of less importance than L'Assomption are granted appropriations for wharves. Again I say the requirements of L'Assomption are more pressing than those of many other towns which are provided for in this year's Estimates.

Cap Chat—extension of training pier, $7,500.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the total cost of this work?

Mr. ROGERS: $30,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the work under way now?

Mr. ROGERS: Not yet.

Mr. MARCIL: Has a contract been awarded?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the depth of water at Cap Chat?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the information here.

Cap de la Madeleine—enlargement of wharf, $4,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Will this $4,000 complete the work?

Mr. ROGERS: No. If my hon. friend will look at the Supplementary Estimates he will find something else in there for this work.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. BUREAU: Was this work given by contract, and if so, to whom.

Mr. ROGERS: Charles Pagé.

Mr. BUREAU: Of Three Rivers?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Were tenders called for this work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, F. A. Barette, $64,000, and Charles Pagé, $49,000.

Mr. BUREAU: The other day I asked the following question:

What is the amount mentioned in the contract for the construction of the wharf at Cap de la Madeleine?

The answer was:

Schedule rates, approximately, $56,000.

If a contract is given for $49,000, how can the cost be $56,000.

Mr. ROGERS: An extra expenditure of $6,694.20 was entailed over the approximate contract price of $49,461.92, making a total of $56,156.12. Authority was given to substitute British Columbia fir for white pine, pitch pine and tamarack specified for the upper section from low water line to the wharf extension under contract.

Mr. BUREAU: That hardly answers my question. There was a change made in the contract, British Columbia fir being called for instead of pine and spruce. Was Mr. Pagé given his price for fir, or were tenders called for?

Mr. ROGERS: No tenders were called for; the price was named by the department, I fancy.

Mr. BUREAU: What was the reason for the change?

Mr. ROGERS: It was impossible to find the required length of timber in the native wood, and it was necessary to substitute British Columbia fir.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the size of the wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: It is 150 feet long by 20 feet wide.

Mr. BUREAU: With a slip in the centre.

Mr. ROGERS: The other section is 200 by 40 feet.

Mr. BUREAU: Are there data in the department as to the number of boats that docked at that pier last year, or for the last four or five years?

Mr. ROGERS: Nothing has been docked there, because the work was under construction.

Mr. BUREAU: But this is the enlargement of a wharf that already existed there. Was it on account of the traffic that the enlargement had to be made?

Mr. ROGERS: I am not sufficiently familiar with local conditions to give my hon. friend that information.

Mr. BUREAU: I want the House to get the information, and I can give it if you like. This is a little wharf situated at the mouth of the St. Maurice river in the county of Champlain. I do not think two steamers ever docked there, and it is easy to see from the length of the dock, 150 feet, that they could not be very large steamers. In the old days, when the wharf was first built, there used to be pilgrimages there, as there was a shrine. There was a little boat called L'Etoile, that used to dock there, carrying pilgrims to the shrine. But I understand that Cap de la Madelaine was a very expensive parish in elections. The hon. minister (Mr. Rogers) speaks of L'Assomption being expensive, but that was before the elections. In this case, this was done after the elections, and was done to square the present member's election accounts. That is my information; if the minister can give better, I hope he will supply it.

Cap St. Ignace—repairs to wharf, $1,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that work started?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. MARCIL: Will tenders be called for? What is the amount proposed to be expended?

Mr. ROGERS: We have nothing very definite as to the amount. We are going to have another survey made.

Mr. MARCIL: Do you propose to make a deep water wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes; twenty-five feet at low water.

Disraeli—repairs to wharf—$2,200.

Mr. TOBIN: May I ask where this wharf is situated?

Mr. ROGERS: This is in Beauce county at the end of lake Aylmer on the Quebec Central railway, 52 miles east of Sherbrooke.

Mr. TOBIN: Is there any water there?

Mr. ROGERS: I presume there is; I hope there is.

Mr. TOBIN: I would like to know. A few years ago statements were made by members of this House, the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) being one, that there was no water in this lake and that this work was not useful. The hon. gentleman went down on an excursion with
12 m. the late hon. member for Lennox, and some other gentleman, and had a photograph taken there, and returned with the statement that there was no water. What repairs is the minister going to make to this wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: The amount is required to replace the present wooden flooring 50 feet long by 36 feet wide with gravel and stone, and to effect other repairs, the estimated cost of which is $2,000.

Mr. TOBIN: I am sure the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) will be scandalized when he hears that the hon. minister is going on with these repairs. It was a useful work when the late Government took it up, and I approve the action of this Government in going ahead with it.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m., Wednesday.

Wednesday, April 7, 1915.

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

WINDING-UP ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), Bill No. 122, to amend the Winding-Up Act, was introduced and read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

MR. E. A. BOUILTON.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Is Mr. E. A. Bouilton, of Paspebiac, Que, employed in any capacity by the Department of Marine and Fisheries or of the Naval Service, or in any other department of the Government?
2. If so, what are his duties, what is his salary, and since when has he been so employed?

Mr. CODERRE: Mr. Bouilton is not in the employ of the Government.

MR. P. A. MOUSSEAU.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Did Mr. P. A. Mousseau, who had been employed as overseer of works for the building of the Louisville post office, formerly occupy any position in any of the departments, or under the Government?

2 If so, what was the position?

3. What is the total amount that he has received as overseer in the building of the said Louisville post office?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. $2,136.

QUEBEC COUNTY TELEPHONE SERVICE.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has the Government built a telephone line in the county of Quebec?

2. If so, (a) what did it cost, and (b) what is the revenue from it?

3. Does that line extend beyond the county of Quebec?

4. Does it compete with other lines already existing and for a long time back giving local and interurban service?

5. What is the quality of the materials used in the construction of that line?

6. Have all the workmen been paid?

7. Who constructed the line for the Government?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Cost $22,000, of which $13,798.91 has been paid; (b) approximately $1,000 a year.

3. No.

4. No.

5. No. 6 wire, 25 foot poles, etc., according to Government standard.

6. No representations have been made to the department that workmen have not been paid.

7. A. Martineau & Co. constructed 128 miles of line and have been paid for 88½ miles.

GRAHAM PEAT PROCESS.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Is the report made by Dr. Porter, of McGill University, on the Graham peat process, final, or is it subject to revision?

2. Does the Government intend applying any funds voted for peat investigation to a demonstration test of the Graham process?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Dr. Porter has revised his report and in the revision states categorically: "The process as outlined and submitted to me by Mr. Graham cannot under any conditions which I foresee in this country for a number of years produce carbonized briquettes in competition with coal at present Montreal prices."

[Mr. Coderre.]

2. In view of the very unfavourable report made by the officers of the department some time ago on the Graham process and of the present adverse report by Dr. Porter, the department cannot recommend an application for funds to make a demonstration test.

DEPORTATION OF FOREIGNERS.

Mr. LACHANCE:

1. Does the Government intend authorizing the deportation of the foreigners who are out of work in the cities of Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Victoria and Vancouver?

2. If so, what department will control such deportation, and on what conditions are foreigners exempt therefrom?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This subject has not been under consideration.

CANADIAN WAR CONTINGENT ASSOCIATION.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Canadian War Contingent Association, of which Sir George Perley, M.P., is president, any connection with the Canadian Field Comforts Commission?

2. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to an appeal for $50,000 addressed to various organized societies of women in Canada by two persons representing themselves to be members of the executive of the association of which Sir George Perley is president, and contained in a circular letter dated 69 Grosvenor street, London, England, October 27, 1914?

3. Do the persons issuing the appeal occupy official positions recognized by the Government? If so, has the Government authorized or approved the appeal?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. The Government has no information on the subject.

2. The attention of the Government has not been drawn to the appeal in question.

3. Answered by No. 2.

MR. LOUIS AUDETTE.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Is Mr. Louis Audette, day labourer of St. Anselme, county of Dorchester, in the employ of the Government?

2. If so, what is his position, and what salary does he receive?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Yes.

2. Caretaker and pumpman at St. Anselme on the National Transcontinental railway. His salary is one dollar per day.

VALCARTIER CAMP LUMBER SUPPLY.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Did the Gravel Lumber Company, of St. Romuald, county of Lévis, sell wood or other materials for the Valcartier camp?

2. If so, what quantity, at what price, and were tenders called for prior to such sale?

3. During the past three years did the Gravel

Lumber Company sell wood or other materials to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners?

4. If so, what quantity, and at what price?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Yes; lumber.

2. 460,624 ft. spruce; $10,603.09. Prices were obtained.

3 and 4. To be answered by Department of Marine and Fisheries.

VALCARTIER CAMP LIGHTING.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. To whom was the contract for the lighting of the Valcartier camp given?

2. What amount was paid by the Government for that lighting?

Major General HUGHES:

1. The Quebec Railway Light, Heat and Power Co., Quebec.

2. $2,535.50.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Have contracts been awarded for the supply of electrical power for the grain elevators of the Quebec Harbour Commission?

2. If so, to whom were such contracts awarded, and what were the amounts of them?

Mr. HAZEN: The following information is furnished by the Quebec Harbour Commission:

"Commissioners generate own electric power for elevator, but have also connection with Q.R.L.H. and P. Company for lights and passenger elevator used when elevator steam plant is not operating.

"Prices are the contract prices for which company supply lights and power to commission as required namely for light 10 cents per K.W.H. less 30 per cent discount. Power for 200 to 400 K.W. horses per months 200 at 3 cents 200 excess at 2.75 400 to 600 K.W. horses per month 400 K.W. at 2.75 excess 200 at 2.3 cents and in addition $1 per H.P. per month on H.P. of motor."

MEDICINE HAT HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

Did Willian Switzer, homestead inspector in the Medicine Hat land district, receive his full salary for the months of March, April and May, 1913?

Mr. CROTHERS: No.

GRANTS TO FISHERMEN.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What amounts, if any, were paid fishermen of Bonaventure and Gaspé counties, respectively, for damages sustained by them in the storm of June 5, 1914?

2. How many fishermen belonged to Gaspé, and how many to Bonaventure county?

3. What are their names, residences, and the amount received by each?

4. How many claims were not entertained?

Mr. HAZEN: No amount was paid to fishermen of any county in the Dominion for material damages sustained by them in the storm of June 5, 1914.

PICTOU COUNTY RURAL MAIL.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has any petition been received asking for a rural mail delivery service from Meadowville to Sundridge via Dufferin Road, county of Pictou?

2. If so, what action has been taken in regard to said petition?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Yes.

2. The matter is still under inquiry. The inspector states that he has received a petition from the residents between Pictou and Cariboo River which covers a portion of the district included in the petition from Meadowville Station to Sundridge, as they believe they will get a better service from Pictou than from Meadowville, and that, therefore, he considers it advisable to withhold all action on these petitions until a satisfactory arrangement can be arrived at so as to give all the districts the best service possible.

MR. T. C. WOODWORTH.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Did any one recommend the employment of T. C. Woodworth in the business of purchasing horses for war purposes in Nova Scotia?

2. If so, who recommended him, and what was the address and occupation stated to be?

Major General HUGHES: There is no record in the department of any such matter.

W. V. PETTET.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. When, and for what reason was W. V. Pettet dismissed from the office of postmaster at Pictou, Ontario?

2. When was his successor, Samuel G. Smith, appointed?

3. Has the Government been informed that, as alleged, he took an active and aggressive part in the last Ontario provincial election held in 1914?

4. If so, is it the intention of the Government to dismiss him from office for having done so?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. On the 12th March, 1913, for political partisanship.

2. On the 13th March, 1913.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Lachance: For a return showing how many Royal Commissions were appointed by the Government since October, 1911, the sub-

jects of investigation and report for each of such commissions; on what dates such commissions were appointed, and on what dates they respectively closed; what persons composed the said commissions, what amount was paid to each of such persons, either as salary or indemnity, and what sums were paid for expenses to each of them; the total amount of the cost for each of such commissions.

Mr. E. Lapointe: For a return showing who are the mail carriers for the rural mail in the counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay; the salary of each such mail carrier, and the trip that each has to make; who are the mail carriers for the rural mails in the parishes of St. Prime and St. Louis de Metabetchouan, and their respective salaries.

SHOOTING BY SENTRIES.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The morning newspapers announce that there has been another case at Cornwall of shooting by a sentry of some innocent people. Has any news reached the department about it?

Major General HUGHES: I suppose that it is on the strength of the newspaper despatch that the right hon. gentleman speaks of these people as innnocent. It is always well to wait before reaching a conclusion. I have seen the item, just as the right hon. gentleman has seen it, but I have no further information on the subject. The people in the locality have been instructed when challenged to halt; also to obey the orders of the soldiers; otherwise, the soldiers cannot carry on their work. It must be remembered that the sentry has no easy job.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And it is stated that the sentries are instructed to shoot to kill.

Major General HUGHES: They were instructed, and are instructed, when any one attacks a soldier, or attempts to disarm him, or to destroy property, to shoot, and when they shoot, to see to it that there is no missing.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In this case, a woman and three children tried to pass the sentries.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Frank Cochrane (Minister of Railways and Canals), the House went into committee on Bill No. 119, to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

[Mr. Lachance.]

On the preamble:

Mr. GRAHAM: This matter was pretty thoroughly discussed on the resolution, but, for the sake of clearness, I wish to state my position again. In the first place, some arrangement should be made for the operation of the Transcontinental until such time as it is completed. The duty of the Government, in my humble judgment, is not to pass this measure to expropriate the property of the Grand Trunk Pacific or of any other company that it desires to expropriate; but immediately, with all possible speed, to complete the eastern division of the Transcontinental, which is not at present completed according to the agreement with the company.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: When is it completed according to the agreement?

Mr. GRAHAM: When the agreement is fulfilled; it certainly is not completed when the terminals at Quebec are not constructed—leaving other matters out of consideration for the time. The award of Sir William Whyte was that all the shops are necessary for the operation of the road.

I was pointing out the duty of the Government to complete the National Transcontinental, so far as the Quebec terminals at least are concerned, and so to be in a position to tell the company: we have fulfilled our part of the agreement, now take over the line or certain proceedings will be taken. Until such time as the project is completed, the step proposed under this legislation is premature.

I do not know that I can add much more. I discussed the matter at some length when the House was in committee on the resolution. It does seem to me that the Government is altogether in advance of the situation which has been created by itself in not completing the work. In the city of Quebec, a line has been purchased from the Canadian Northern Railway for the standardizing of which a grant is now asked in the Estimates. The station in Quebec is not begun; the shops are just started; the small station at Champlain market is only nicely begun. As a matter of fact, there is nothing in Quebec to take care of the Quebec traffic under this agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. It has been stated that the fact that the Quebec bridge is not completed may be suggested by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company as a reason for their not taking over the road.

That contention will not stand for a moment before any tribunal when the documents are produced.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: To what documents does the hon. gentleman refer?

Mr. GRAHAM: I refer to a letter sent to the Railway Department by Mr. Hays himself, in which he admitted that the company would consider the operation of a ferry at Quebec as fulfilment of the contract providing for a continuous line. That letter was received by the Railway Department and was left by me in that department.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is not there now.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not my fault; it ought to be there.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the date of that letter?

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot say at this time. I remember distinctly receiving the letter, taking it to Council, showing it to the Prime Minister and having it filed in the department.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: About what date?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was some time before Mr. Hays' death. It was written by Mr. Hays in connection with some other correspondence, and I think a careful search will result in its being found in the department. I am prepared to say that such a letter was received. As I have pointed out, I think the Government should complete the project so that the company will have no reasonable grounds for objection on that score, and then, if the company do not proceed to fulfil their contract, that will be the proper time to take such steps as may be deemed necessary. At the present time, however, I think it is inopportune for the Government to pass legislation giving them powers which, to my mind, they are not in a position to act upon without violating the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, because the Government, in my humble judgment, has not completed the project according to the agreement.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Government already has a substantial portion of the powers set forth in this amendment, inasmuch as last year it was provided by an Act then passed that, until the Grand Trunk Pacific railway should accept a lease and undertake operation, the Minister of Railways and Canals might himself operate the road. The present legislation carries that further, in this respect; that it gives to the Minister of Railways, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, authority to lease a branch line which would be an essential portion of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway. It supplies that which was left unprovided for in the Act of last year, and it thoroughly subserves the purpose which was intended to be accomplished by that Act. That Act, if I remember correctly, received the unanimous assent of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is all right, but this proposed legislation goes farther than that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In what way?

Mr. GRAHAM: It takes power otherwise to acquire—that means, to expropriate—that line from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company; to expropriate its terminals or terminals belonging to any other company. One of the points I endeavoured to raise was that if the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company then proposed to take over the line, the Government would find itself the owner of all these terminals, and the line as well.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As a matter of fact, it was contended—and I thought it was a well-founded contention—that so important a branch as the Lake Superior branch might very well belong to the Government, assuming that the Government were to have ownership, as it has ownership, of the whole of the eastern division from Moncton to Winnipeg. The objection that my hon. friend makes is based, I understand, on the suggestion that the Government may expropriate. I am not at all sure that the word "acquire" would have that meaning.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is the construction that was put upon it by the Solicitor General.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is possible that it might bear that construction, but I should rather think that if power to expropriate were to be conferred, some words of a more definite character would be used. I was not here during the discussion, and was not aware that my hon. friend the Solicitor General had expressed that opinion. The authority to take away, against his will, the common law property or rights of any citizen in this or any other country, even at the instance of the Crown, must be couched in very express terms. Further

than that, it is a very familiar principle that even if compensation is not provided for in the act of expropriation, the courts will always construe any such statute as contemplating compensation to the extent of the value of the property and ten per cent additional. My hon. friend says that this legislation is inopportune. There is something that would be very much more inopportune and unfortunate, namely, that this road being in effect complete for all practical purposes, although it may not be technically completed within the meaning of the Act, should remain unoperated. That is the reason why the Government introduced last year, and has introduced again this year, legislation to prevent that particular condition being brought about. Any hon. gentleman would find it exceedingly difficult to look at the legislation and the contracts of 1903-4 and come to a conclusion as to what the completion of that road meant, within the meaning of that legislation and those contracts. As a matter of fact, a railway, in one sense, is never complete. There has not been a year since the Canadian Pacific railway has been completed that work of an important character has not been done upon it; particularly is this true of the last twenty years. The Grand Trunk Pacific railway has been operated in the West for three or four years; it has been handling large passenger and freight traffic, although as yet it is not technically completed—a long way from it. Would my hon. friend suggest that under those circumstances a railway, although not absolutely technically completed, ought to remain unoperated? Does he suggest that it is in the interests of the people of the country that it should remain unoperated? We have taken the responsibility of deciding that any such condition would be most unfortunate, and detrimental to the public interest. We are not looking forward to any controversy with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in regard to this matter, but it is necessary to make provision for that which might possibly occur. Suppose it were suggested to the company: this road is as complete as the road which has been operated in the West for three or four years; while it may not be technically complete, nevertheless it is for all practical purposes complete within the meaning of this Act, and it is your duty to proceed to take a lease and to operate. If the company raised the contention that they are not bound to operate that road until such and such absolute conditions have been complied with, we find that the contract and the statutes of 1903-4, unfortunately, contain no provisions definitely determining the matter. I am not quite sure that if such a question arose it might be determined by arbitration; otherwise it would have to be determined by the courts. In either case there would be very considerable delay. In the case of a determination by the courts, two or three years might be involved. We want to avoid all that. We have no desire or intention of having any controversy or difficulty with the company, and we do not propose to look forward to anything of the kind. My own attitude—and this has been the attitude of the Government as well since we came into power—has been to deal with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company in respect of this enterprise precisely in the same way and to extend to them precisely the same consideration in every respect as if the enterprise had been initiated by the party which is now charged with the responsibilities of office, and I venture to state that no instance can be found in which that policy has been departed from.

With respect to what my hon. friend suggests about the Quebec bridge, I do not desire to apprehend that any unfair or unreasonable difficulty will be caused by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. I am not going to apprehend anything of the kind until it actually occurs. But we must not be blind to the consideration that a contract formally executed under the authority of the board of directors and sanctioned by a vote of the shareholders cannot legally be set aside or modified by a letter from Mr. Hays as president of that road; at least that is my present impression. The contract of 1903-4 was executed under the authority of the board of directors of the company. The board of directors of the company, if I remember correctly, were required to place the contract before the shareholders. That contract, made in that way, with these legal formalities, might not be changed, so far as its legal effect is concerned, by the mere letter of the president of the road, however important his position or however extensive his authority. We have to take into account considerations of that kind. We discussed the matter in a very friendly way with the officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company, and, unless I am mistaken, the legislation was submitted to them either in the exact form in which it is now presented to the House or in a form substantially the same; and, as far as my

knowledge of the attitude of the company goes, they have not any desire to oppose it, nor, as far as I understand, do they oppose it in any way. It is a reasonable precaution which we are taking for the purpose of preventing the road from remaining without operation during a period in which some question might reasonably be raised by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company as to its duty to take over the road for operation and as to the right of the Government to enforce that operation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The only correspondence which has been submitted to the House is simply to show that there is a disagreement between the company and the Government, now representing the commission of construction, as to whether or not the road is completed according to the terms of the contract. That is all the information that we have before us. My right hon. friend stated a moment ago that the company does not offer any objection to this legislation. That may be. In his absence the other day the Minister of Railways stated that the company were anxious to hand over this road to the Government—that they did not desire to operate it. That also may be true. But of this we have no information, and my hon. friend knows that is not the way to deal with Parliament—to give word of mouth. We should have correspondence and written documents and evidence upon that point. I do not question the word of the Minister of Railways at all; I am not prepared to say that Mr. Chamberlin, the president of the company, did not say what was attributed to him; but I would like to know the circumstances under which Mr. Chamberlin made that suggestion. As to this we have no evidence. The only thing we have before us is that there is a disagreement between the engineers of the company and the engineers of the Government as to the completion of the road.

I shall not go over the discussion we had the other day; but in our judgment, which I think is fully sustained by the statute in that behalf, whenever a question of this kind arises the method of settlement provided by the statute is arbitration. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that the road, while completed in a sense, may never be completed. I know the Canadian Pacific railway may be truly said not to be completed, because it is a matter of notoriety that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been building and rebuilding its line again and again. But my hon. friend knows that the intention of the engineers charged with the work was to build this railway once for all. And now my hon. friend asks, how are we going to determine that? There is an easy way of determining it. The plans and specifications were prepared by the company and the Government together, they were joint specifications, and everything was done under the signatures of both engineers. The question now is whether or not the work contemplated by those specifications is completed. If the work is completed, then the company can be compelled to take over the road. If there is a disagreement between the engineers, I repeat, we can go to arbitration. I can understand that the company is not anxious to take over the road. I gave reasons the other day. The company has been treated most contemptuously in this matter. My hon. friend says the company has been treated with every consideration possible. That may be. I know, of course, that the Government has advanced aid to the company by way of loans on more than one occasion; but as to the construction of the road, and the terminals at Quebec especially, while I do not know what issue they take with the Government, the company cannot but feel that they have been treated with great contempt and in defiance of their legitimate rights and aspirations. My hon. friend knows the details, but I do not suppose that it is disputed that shops and terminals are essential to a railway, and the company cannot be asked to take over the railway and operate it unless it has been provided with terminals. Terminals are just as essential for the operating of the road as the road bed itself. The Quebec terminals, which were provided for by the company and the commission of that day on a joint agreement satisfactory to both, have been simply discarded by the present Administration and another agreement substituted.

The Minister of Railways stated the other day that they have provided for joint terminals at Quebec, with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I take issue with him and say that such a union station, placed in the valley of the St. Charles river and not in the valley of the St. Lawrence, cannot be as useful to the company as the station which we had provided for. Let that stand for the time being. I refreshed my memory by reading the contract with the Canadian Pacific railway, as brought down by the Government itself, and what do I find? I find that the agreement

between the Government and the Canadian Pacific railway for the union station contemplates and provides only for a terminal for the Grand Trunk Pacific railroad, and that the Grand Trunk Railway Company itself, the parent company of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, is excluded from that agreement. Can anybody imagine that the Grand Trunk Pacific will accept as satisfactory an agreement for joint terminals for the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific, and not for the Grand Trunk railway itself? It cannot agree to that. Up to the present time, so far as I know, it has refused to accept that agreement, because not a tittle of evidence has been produced to show that the company ever acceded to the demand made by the Minister of Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for these joint terminals. It is not surprising, therefore, that under the circumstances the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company should say: the contract has not been lived up to, and we are not in a position to take over the road. I would think that the best way to settle the matter would be by arbitration; but that may take some time. Whether the position of the company is well founded or not, there is a disagreement between the company and the Government. So far so good —or so bad. My hon. friend says that the road must be operated. Certainly; we agree that the road must be operated. Last year when the Government asked for legislation to operate the road, pending the settlement of these difficulties, we offered not a word of objection, but agreed that the road must be operated; and to-day we say that the road must be operated.

But I should like to call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that this legislation which he is submitting is not of a temporary but of a permanent character. Let me read the legislation which we are now asked to sanction, and then ask whether it has not altogether the appearance of permanent legislation so designed that the Government can take possession of the road and operate it itself. If such be the intent of the Government, we should like to know it. I did not draw that conclusion from the remarks made by my right hon. friend a moment ago. No other interpretation can be placed upon this legislation than that it is intended to enable the Government to take over the ownership of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Let me read the section:

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

The Minister of Railways and Canals may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, lease or otherwise acquire—

We discussed these words " or otherwise acquire " with the Solicitor General the other day, and in his opinion they were broad enough to cover the case of expropriation, if that were necessary. Of course, an agreement may be entered into which would render expropriation proceedings unnecessary.

The Minister of Railways and Canals may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, lease or otherwise acquire that portion of the railway of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company known as the Lake Superior branch, extending from Lake Superior Junction to the city of Fort William in Ontario, including terminal facilities and accommodation works of the said company or of any other company, and for all the purposes of this section may provide, by purchase, lease or otherwise, rolling stock and equipment; and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and such other company is each hereby authorized on its part to deal accordingly with the said line of railway or terminal facilities and accommodation works as the case may be.

I say that no interpretation can be placed on these words other than that the Government intends to acquire the Grand Trunk Pacific, either by expropriation, purchase or otherwise, and to operate the enterprise itself.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): In the debate the other day I think we discussed pretty fully the question of the non-completion of the road. I must take exception to the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), that there is ample provision in Quebec for all the traffic. As I stated the other day, we have entered into an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway by which we cannot only use the Canadian Pacific railway terminals, station, yards and so on, but also run right down to the docks built by the Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Government has built no docks there.

Mr. COCHRANE: The docks were built by the Harbour Commissioners, who are practically the Government. Whoever operates the road has to get down to the docks, and if we had not made this arrangement we should have had to expropriate a tremendous amount of valuable property in order to get down to the docks. I take issue with the statement of the leader of the Opposition that the Act provides that the question of the completion of the road

shall be settled by arbitration. The only thing it says about arbitration is that the engineers can be called in to arbitrate on the construction of any portion of the line. Nothing at all is said about arbitrating on the completion of the road. Take the Grand Trunk Pacific at Edmonton. They have no route through Edmonton now, and no facilities, yet they are operating there, and most successfully, I think. They are running one of the best trains between Edmonton and Winnipeg that there is in Canada to-day.

Mr. OLIVER: The Grand Trunk Pacific have made arrangements at Edmonton. They have freight arrangements of their own.

Mr. COCHRANE: They have no through arrangements in Edmonton, and have never pretended that they have.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg to correct the minister. They have freight arrangements of their own.

Mr. COCHRANE: Where is their passenger station in Edmonton for their terminals? Where do they get through Edmonton?

Mr. OLIVER: They get through by an arrangement with the Canadian Northern railway.

Mr. COCHRANE: We do not know anything about that arrangement. It has never been brought before Parliament or before the Department of Railways or before the Railway Commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has the agrement with the Canadian Pacific railway at Quebec been brought before Parliament?

Mr. COCHRANE: No. But they do not want to get out of it, or intend to get out of it. As far as the Lake Superior branch is concerned, I claim that as a matter of policy it should never belong to the Grand Trunk Pacific. It should belong to the owners of the Transcontinental. It is the key to the West. As I stated in a previous debate we are not desirous of operating the Transcontinental. We want the company to take it over. Year by year we shall have to work on capital account to improve the road. On the portion of the road between lake Superior and Winnipeg, which was completed by the late Government, there are wooden trestles that will have to be strengthened in some way or filled. That will be a capital charge. The ex-Minister of Railways has made a point in regard to Mr. Hay's letter in reference to the Quebec bridge. But the leader of the Government says that a letter is no good because it is not a document.

Mr. GRAHAM: A letter is a document.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is not a legal document. As has been stated by the leader of the Government, it would not commit the company if we were to take a legal opinion on it. The right hon. leader of the Opposition has also referred to the specifications. Now there are hundreds of classes in those specifications, as to which half a dozen different opinions could be held. The engineers themselves cannot agree as to the meaning of some parts of the specifications. If we were to say that the contract had been completed according to specifications, I think we should have a hard time to substantiate that before a court. The terminals at Fort William are not owned by the Grand Trunk Pacific; they are owned by a separate company. I am not so sure whether the elevator is owned by another company or not, but the terminals are. That is the reason they are mentioned in this way in the Bill. I am sure that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, or the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, will admit that we would be very foolish to attempt to operate this road without having the right to the use of the branch down to Fort William. I made the statement the other day, and I know it will not be denied, that Mr. Chamberlin, now the president of the road, told me—I will take his word for it and I will get a document from him for it—that he would agree to any terms that we might arrange with the Canadian Pacific Railway and others. He said that he would accept those terms, and he will not go back on that. I should say in fairness to him though, that, while he does not approve of the arrangement, still he will not go back on the agreement. I claim the road is fully completed for operation. We have provided in Quebec for every part of the operation there. As for the suggestion that the shops have not been completed, let me tell the committee that they have not a shop on the whole 1,800 miles from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert except small shops which they have at the divisional points. I made the statement the other day, and I repeat it now, that at every divisional point from Winnipeg to Moncton we have shops far superior to any that they have on their part of the road; yet they have operated more than half of that road now for four years.

On the mountain section they have only four divisional points with very few stations or yards equipped, and

12 noon.

yet they are operating to probably as great an extent as we will operate in the East unless business improves during the next year. My hon. friend takes the ground that the terminals at Quebec will not be equal to the terminals formerly proposed. I am satisfied that, both in the interest of the railway and of the business community at Quebec, the change in the terminals will prove to be a desirable one. We are building down into the city of Quebec for the purpose of taking care of the business there. We believe that the harbour of Quebec will be much more important than it has ever been in the past. In order to be able to participate in the business at Quebec, and to compete with the Canadian Pacific railway and other roads, it was necessary for us to get down to the Louise Basin.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals is very inconsistent in so far as his dealing with the president of the Grand Trunk Pacific is concerned, because in connection with the Quebec bridge he says that the country is not safe in taking the letter of the president.

Mr. COCHRANE: I only referred to that in connection with the statement of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. They said that the president was doubtless morally bound to stand by that letter of the former president.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As far as the bridge is concerned, I understand that the question came up when the late Government was in office and that the president of the company, acting for the company and speaking in the name of the company, expressly waived the matter of the completion of the Quebec bridge as essential to the completion of the contract. The minister seems doubtful as to whether that would be binding. The way to ascertain whether it would be binding or not is to request the president of the company to have the board of directors, or shareholders, ratify it and put it in the form of a contract. I cannot see why that has not been done by this Government. One would think that during the nearly four years that they have been in office, in a matter of such vast importance as this, if they had any doubt as to the company being bound by the letter of the president, they would have taken steps to have that matter confirmed and the letter put in proper legal form. But while the minister says there is doubt as to the binding character of that letter, when it comes to another question, the question of the changes in the terminals, the changes in the location of the workshops at Quebec and the changes in the grades of the road, the minister says that the president has told him so and so and that he will take his word for it, showing that when the minister wants to rely upon the word of the president he is quite willing to take his word, but when he does not want to rely on an assurance of the president he does not want to take his letter.

Mr. COCHRANE: The hon. gentleman is unfair to me in that respect.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In what respect?

Mr. COCHRANE: In what the hon. gentleman has just said. I was only making a comparison.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I accept the minister's statement, but after all is it not all nonsense for the Government to keep the country and Parliament in doubt as to these verbal statements and as to these statements by letter? Why have they not put the matter in writing? The minister knows perfectly well that the road must be built according to the specifications which were agreed upon. It is of enormous importance in connection with a road that is going to cost this country, according to the hon. gentleman, something like $50,000,000—

An hon. MEMBER: How many?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Something like $50,000,000.

Mr. COCHRANE: What?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Something like $50,000,000.

Mr. COCHRANE: Fifty million?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, making allowance for interest for seven years, and assuming, of course, that the road will be self-sustaining after that. It is of very great importance and one would have thought that the Government would have taken steps to have had the waiver condition as to the Quebec bridge put in proper form.

Mr. COCHRANE: That only came up quite recently.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That only came up quite recently? How could it help coming up? It must have been in the mind of the minister from the time he took office. Here is the gap of the Quebec bridge not completed, and it will not be completed for a number of years, across which the traffic will be carried by ferry. It never came up, says the minister, and yet he asked this Parliament for an appropriation to establish a car ferry at Quebec. One would have thought that it would have come to the minister's mind at once. When he was asking Parliament for authority to engage in an expenditure of $1,000,000 or more, one would have thought that the question of making an agreement in writing in order to carry out the assurance of the president that the establishment of a ferry would be regarded as a completion of the line would have been uppermost in his mind.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has stated that so far as he knows the company has no objection to this legislation. Surely there is another question involved besides what may be the wishes of the company. This committee knows very well that when it was proposed to construct the Transcontinental railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific wanted to stop at North Bay and did not want to have anything to do with a line east of North Bay. They recognized that it was the prairie section, the section between the foothills of the Rocky mountains and the head of the Great Lakes, which would be the profitable portion of the line, and they felt that if, in the summer season, they could bring their freight and a great many of their passengers to Fort William and carry them down over the lakes to their connection with the Grand Trunk railway at Sarnia, it would be much more profitable to them, and that if they could get a connection at North Bay so as to bring their all-rail traffic down to the junction with the Grand Trunk there, and in this way carry the produce of the West over the Grand Trunk to the Grand Trunk ports, it would be more advantageous to the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific. But the Government, led by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), insisted from the very commencement that the road must be carried right through to Moncton, where it would join the Intercolonial and over which the traffic could be distributed to the ports of the Maritime Provinces. That was regarded as onerous by the Grand Trunk Pacific, but the Government insisted, and rightly insisted, upon it.

One could very well understand that, if the Grand Trunk Pacific could be let out of this bargain as far as the line east of Winnipeg is concerned, if they could get many millions of dollars under expropriation for their terminals at Fort William and still be allowed to use the line as far east as Fort William and to abandon all idea of operating the main line between Winnipeg and Moncton, that proposition might commend itself to the Grand Trunk Pacific and enable them to carry out the ideas which they entertained at the commencement, but which the late Government prevented them from carrying into effect. Therefore, apart from the Grand Trunk Pacific, there is involved the important question of having a transcontinental line operated by one company carrying the traffic between the East and the West, between the Atlantic and the Pacific, that company operating all parts of that line and developing, as a great transcontinental railway company can develop, the country through which it passes. Speaking for the Maritime Provinces, I desire to enter my most earnest protest against any proposition that will lead the Grand Trunk Pacific to believe that it may be released from the operation of the eastern section of the Transcontinental. That is what this proposition is looking to, that is, for the Government to expropriate the line between Lake Superior Junction and Fort William, to become the owner of it, and then with what justice, with what reason—

Mr. COCHRANE: Should we not be the owner of it when we own the other line?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not at all.

Mr. COCHRANE: I am glad the country knows that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is not the slightest reason why we should be the owner of it. The Government does not own a single branch of the Transcontinental railway anywhere; it owns no branch betweeen Ottawa and the Transcontinental, between Montreal and the Transcontinental, nor between St. John and the Transcontinental. The idea which the late Government had in view was to construct one main line that was to be leased to the Grand Trunk Pacific for a period of fifty years. That company were to become the operators of the line, and an Act passed at the time

gave them power to construct branch lines and also provided what should be done with the branch lines in case at the end of the fifty years the Government should take over the operation of the main line. That was all clearly provided for; but let the Government under the power granted by this legislation take over the line between Superior Junction and Fort William, and, I ask, with what justice or reason could the Grand Trunk Pacific be compelled to enter upon the operation of the main line?

My hon. friend says that there is no power conveyed in the Act to determine when the line is completed. I must confess that I have heard many extraordinary statements made in this House, although not by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, who says so few things that he is not apt to say anything extraordinary. He is careful and uses good judgment; but he is led astray to-day, and he makes a most extraordinary statement when he says that the provision in section 7 of the Act of 1903, which says that any question as to the work—

Mr. COCHRANE: As to the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes—that any question as to the work in regard to which the engineers differ shall be left to arbitration, applies to all matters during construction, but has no application to the question of the completion of the line. In other words, up to fifteen minutes before the last bit of ballast is put in, the engineers have everything to do with the question whether the line is built right up to the specifications or not; but at the last minute, when the last shovelful or the last carload of ballast is put in, the jurisdiction of the engineers and the third arbitrator, whom they are to appoint, absolutely ceases, and they have no power to say whether the road has been built according to the specifications or not. I would not have thought it possible, but for the respect that I have for the good judgment of my hon. friend the minister, for me to believe that any gentleman of good judgment would make a statement like that in this House. As I said the other day, take the case of a man building a house, which is a matter of large importance, the owner has his architect, and the contractor has his architect to look after the work. It is provided that the house must be built according to the specifications agreed upon; that the work must be done under the joint supervision of the two architects and upon their joint inspection and joint acceptance, and that if there shall arise between the two architects any question as to the work upon which they cannot agree, they shall choose a third arbitrator, and if they fail to choose one, he shall be chosen by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Surely, if the question arose between the two architects whether the house were entirely completed according to the specifications or not, that would be a case for calling in a third arbitrator to determine that question.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Is there not a very well-decided case on record in Hudson on building contracts, that the power given to arbitrators to determine whether or not work done is done in accordance with the specifications does not cover the power to determine whether or not it is completed? There is a very clear distinction between the work and the completion.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think so, and I doubt very much if my hon. friend can produce authority to that effect.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There are some legal men in this country who probably would be almost if not quite as capable of forming an opinion upon this as even my hon. friend, and who do not entertain the same view as he does.

Mr. PUGSLEY: During my professional career, I have always had great respect for the opinion of others, and I have often found that their opinions have prevailed; but still all that I can do is to state my own view—that is what I have always endeavoured to do in discussing legal propositions—and then leave it to the court to determine whether my view is correct or not. I would be surprised to find that any court or any lawyer of high standing would determine that, where a question of having the work done according to the specifications arises, and all authority is given to the engineers as to supervision, inspection and acceptance and the provision as to what shall be done in case of a difference shall have to do with everything in connection with the work up to the completion of it, and yet have nothing to do with the completion. That which has led the Minister of Railways astray, I think, is that he thinks of a railway as different from an ordinary work. For instance, a house, he would say, is completed when it is built according to the specifications, and nothing further need be done; but a railway is con-

stantly expanding and new work will be required, and therefore, according to his view, a railway can never be said to be "completed" in the sense in which a house is "completed." But you must read the word in connection with the specifications. When the work is done according to the specifications, that work is "completed" under the terms of the contract. Suppose that the specifications did not provide for water-tanks. If the Government builds the road according to the specifications and without water-tanks, that road is "completed" under the contract, and if the company wants water-tanks they must put them in themselves. The word "completed" in section 20 of the Act means completed in accordance with the specifications.

Now, the Act provides that when the road is completed the company shall be called upon to enter into the lease. That means, it seems to me, as clearly as words can make it, when the contract is completed according to specifications.

Mr. COCHRANE: Where is the clause authorizing the building of the shops at all?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that the specifications provide for the building of the shops.

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then, if that is the case, I think the hon. gentleman should show that everything required by the specifications has been done—that the grades, the curves, the workshops, the terminals, are made according to the specifications—and his engineer would be able to say that the road is "completed."

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the specifications left out a bridge, would the same result follow?

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is putting a very extreme case.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: You have to test the argument by these extreme cases.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It would not be a railway if the bridge were left out. In a case like that, I think the course would be to dismiss both engineers and try to get out of the difficulty as best you could. But the point I have sought to make, and it may be that I am entirely wrong through being very stupid—is that it seems absolutely clear to me that under the statute "completion" of the line, means completion according to the specifications. Let me use again the illustration I gave the other day: Suppose the Minister of Railways had given the company a subsidy to be paid on the completion of its line of railway, specifications being provided. Surely, if the road is not perfect, yet, when the specifications are complied with the minister could not refuse to pay that subsidy. He pays the subsidy when his engineer reports that the specifications have been complied with. That is what is meant by the "completion" of the railway.

Let me add just a word before I resume my seat, to emphasize in the strongest way possible, the mistake that this Government, in my opinion, is making, in not asking the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to enter upon the temporary operation of this line pending the completion of the entire road in accordance with the specifications. I charge the Minister of Railways with not treating this House fairly, with not treating the country fairly. Two years ago I brought this matter up and called his attention, and the attention of the Prime Minister, to the fact that the late president of the road, Mr. Hays, had made an offer to the Government to take over the road as the different portions were completed and to operate the line, providing the necessary rolling stock, upon a basis of which no one could complain. Let me repeat it again, in view of this extraordinary legislation, so that no one can forget it. The offer was that they would put on their own rolling stock; they would operate the line under Government supervision; the whole business should be subject to the audit of the Government, and if there was any profit from the operation that profit should be handed over to the treasury of the country, and if there was a deficit, the amount should be added to the capital account on which the company would pay interest as it was to pay interest on the whole cost of the line. I called the attention of the minister to this offer, and he stated in this House that he would take the matter up with the Grand Trunk Pacific and see if they were still willing to enter into an agreement of that kind, and inform the House at a later date. Up to this moment he has not made any statement to this House that the Grand Trunk Pacific had been approached with a view to entering upon the operation of the completed portions of the line upon these terms. And, though this committee has no information

that there has been any effort to get the Grand Trunk Pacific to enter upon the temporary operation of the line, pending its entire completion, when they will be obliged to enter into the formal lease, the minister comes here to-day and asks authority to involve this country in an expenditure of many millions for rolling stock to enable the Government to operate the line, and to incur an expenditure of many millions further to acquire the road between Superior Junction and Fort William, with all the vast works connected with it, including the great elevators which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company have constructed at Fort William. The proposition is entirely indefensible, and I think the country will not approve of it when an opportunity is given them to express their opinion.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not going to enter into the legal phases of this case; I should get lost if I tried it; for when the lawyers themselves disagree, a layman would get hopelessly muddled in the argument. But I do say that any business man reading this section will say that there was provision for the settlement of difficulties as to construction, not only during the progress of the work, but as to completion as well. The question whether the road is "completed" or not, is simply a question whether it is completed under the agreement. On that we have a difference of opinion. I contend the road is not completed under the agreement. The Prime Minister takes a different view from that which, in his absence, was presented to the House the other day. If it were simply a lease for temporary operation by the Government of this branch line in connection with the through line, I do not know that I should object. But we were told the other day, or the House was led to believe, that the expropriation was to be used as a weapon against the Grand Trunk Pacific to compel them to do certain things. That is the wrong attitude in which to approach the company on this great question; for this is not a small question, but one affecting the whole nation. The Minister of Railways to-day rather gives intimation that it is the intention of the Government to buy this road.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, I said it was not in the interest of the country. I want to treat my hon. friend fairly, and I hope he will accept what I say.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. GRAHAM: I am going to put my own construction on what the hon. minister said. I am not changing his statement, but only giving what I infer from his statement. The Minister of Railways says that it would be in the interests of the country if the Government owned this branch line as well as the through line; I infer, therefore, that he is in favour of purchasing it. According to my understanding of what the Solicitor General has said, this proposed legislation gives the Government the power to do what the Minister of Railways says it would be a good thing to do. This would seem to embrace a much larger power than that referred to by my right hon. friend, which includes merely the operation by the Government for a time of the whole line, including that branch line. The investment of perhaps $30,000,000 in the purchase of this line, and of an enormous sum in the taking over of terminals, certainly should not be made until the approval of Parliament is obtained, and some provision to this effect should be inserted in this proposed legislation.

Mr. COCHRANE: Supposing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company would not accept a lease, and the wheat crop were ready to be carried, would it be in the interests of the country that there should be no way of overcoming that difficulty? I do not think that there will be any trouble, but if there should be when Parliament is not in session, we would have no power to take action.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Prime Minister rather takes the view that power to expropriate is not conferred under this Act, and if that view should prevail I would not have any objection to make. But there seems to be a possibility that the Government may exercise that power by buying out the entire line and all terminals, and investing a large amount of additional capital in this great enterprise; then they will be compelled to operate or to make some arrangement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. If it is made clear that under this statute power to expropriate is not given, I shall have no objection to the proposed legislation, but I do seriously object if the Government is to be given power to invest another $30,000,000 or $50,000,000 in property which includes terminal elevators belonging to another company.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it would be reasonable to suppose that, having in view the present condition of the money

markets of the world, the Government would not be very much disposed to incur an expenditure of $30,000,000 or $50,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring this line. It is not necessary to go into the question of what would have been wise in the first instance, although there is a great deal to be said in favour of the view that the line should have been owned by the Government, inasmuch as the Government owned the line from Winnipeg to Moncton. There has been a good deal of discussion in regard to the operation of the branch lines of the Intercolonial by the same company, and possibly some of those considerations might have forcible application to what has been urged here. It is not worth while to enter into a discussion of a legal question which this committee cannot settle. My hon. friend the member for St. John city (Mr. Pugsley), whose opinion on any legal subject is entitled to a great deal of respect, has expressed an opinion, but we are not advised that the view which he has expressed is correct. I would point out to him that one cannot afford to be too sure of these things. I have no doubt that my hon. friend was equally cocksure with regard to the effect of the implementing clause; but the Privy Council told him that he was wrong.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I venture to say that my hon. friend will not find anywhere an expression of opinion on my part contrary to the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend was a member of the Government of that day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not when the contract was entered into.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, but when the contract was being acted on, and when the Government put the case before the Privy Council for decision. It is with some surprise that I learn that the hon. gentleman differed from his colleagues in his view of what that contract meant. If that is what he intends to convey, I was never aware of it before. The late Administration were very sure of their ground, but they found that they were mistaken, and their mistake has cost the country a great many millions of dollars. We want to avoid mistakes of that kind, so far as possible; therefore we do not profess to be so cocksure on these questions of legal construction as my hon. friend the member for St. John City professes to be. What the Government desires is that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company shall fulfil the conditions of the contract and statutes made and passed in 1903-4. We have urged and will urge that upon them, and I have no reason to believe at the present time that any serious controversy will arise. If any controversy does arise, we will endeavour to come to Parliament with any proposals that the public interest demand. After all, there is very little of this legislation that was not contained in the legislation of last year, which provided for the operation of this road by the Governmeent until the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company should accept a lease and undertake its operation. That Act was passed without dissent, and we are now asking that in case it should become necessary to operate the road during any such period as has been suggested, we should also have power to make suitable arrangements for the operation by the Government of the branch line from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You are asking much more than that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What else?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: To acquire.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: To lease, or otherwise acquire. I have not yet had impressed upon me the detriment to the public interest which would result from that. The hon. member for St. John City has alluded to the interests of the Maritime Provinces. I suppose those interests would appeal to me as much as they would to him, and I fail to see why the interests of the maritime provinces would not be thoroughly safeguarded if the Government should also acquire the line from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William. In what way would the public interest of any part of this country be detrimentally affected by the carrying out of even that proposal? We have not that proposal in mind; we desire simply to make provision for temporary operation of the whole eastern division, including this branch line, until the Grand Trunk Pacific, under the terms of its contract and agreement shall accept the lease and take over the operation of the road. We think this legislation is necessary because it would be manifestly to the utter detriment of the public interest that a road upon which nearly $200,000,000 has been expended should remain idle for any considerable period of time after it is clearly capable of operation in the interest of the public. That is all that we desire; to

guard against that is all that this legislation is intended for.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But we want to know exactly what is meant. We were told a moment ago by the Minister of Railways – and it is repeated by the Prime Minister —that the object of this legislation is simply to enable the Government to operate the road pending the negotiation with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or the Government's taking over the operation. If that be the object, we know where we are. But what I point out to my hon. friend is that he is asking much more than this power to operate; he is asking the power to acquire. If the object of the legislation is simply to permit an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company providing for the operation of the road pending the settlement of their difficulty, this Bill may be sufficient. But if the ultimate object —I will not use the word " concealed," but I might—is to permit the Government to acquire the road permanently under the plea that it would be better for the country to do so, then this Bill would be insufficient. In the first place, we might say that the object is to have a temporary arrangement for the leasing of the road for a limited period. There would be no question of coming back to Parliament for ratification in that case. But if the object be to acquire the road and acquire it permanently, then I contend that this ought to be supplemented by the necessity of the Government coming to Parliament for ratification of such an agreement. That is a question not of policy but of how this statute is to be drafted.

Mr. OLIVER: As I read this Bill and as I have listened to the remarks upon it and the various explanations that have been given regarding it, I can only conclude that it is a Bill to ask Parliament to give the Government authority to do as it pleases in regard to a matter of the highest and greatest importance to the welfare of this country. I do not think that the circumstances are such that it would be to the benefit of the country that that authority should be given. I do not think it is in the best interests of the country that the authority has been asked. If the explanation given by the Prime Minister a few moments ago is correct, the Bill is then most unfortunately worded. If the intention was that this Bill should give the Government power to operate the road to lake Superior until a permanent arrangement is made with the Grand Trunk Pacific to operate it, the Bill should have said so. But it says the direct opposite, it provides absolutely for the leasing of the branch or that it be otherwise acquired. And, as has been fully and very definitely explained to us by the Solicitor General, that meant the right to expropriate. He went on to speak of expropriating the lease as well as expropriating the road, so there can be no question whatever as to the explanation given to us by the Solicitor General.

Mr. COCHRANE: Expropriate what lease?

Mr. OLIVER: He said we are taking power so that if there is a lease we can expropriate that lease as well as expropriate the road.

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine that applies to terminals.

Mr. OLIVER: What ever it applies to I remember he used those words. Therefore the explanation given us by the Solicitor General is that the intention of the Government is to take power to own this road if it so pleases, whereas the explanation given by the Prime Minister is that that is not the intention of the Government, but merely that the Government shall have authority to operate the road during a certain intervening period.

Mr. COCHRANE: You will admit that if we are to run the balance of the road from Moncton to Winnipeg we should not be in a position that we could not run to Fort William, especially when the wheat is being moved.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are perfectly willing to meet the wishes of my right hon. friend. We have no such ulterior motive as he seems to have in his mind, and we are willing to make it clear that if we should acquire the road by purchase or expropriation we must come back to Parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I suppose my right hon. friend's idea is that the word " expenditure " might include the purchase price of the road.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The word " acquire " certainly means purchase.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would depend not on that, but on the word "expenditure" in subsection 7. I suppose my hon. friend's argument is that under subsection 4 we

might acquire and under subsection 7 we might pay. We did not intend that, and I am willing to make that plain.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why not leave out the expression " or by other means acquire " ?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would be willing to make the change suggested by my hon. friend, and to say plainly that if we do anything else we must come back to Parliament.

Mr. OLIVER: I had in mind the query of the Prime Minister as to what public interest is going to be affected by the action the Government proposes to take. In the present condition of finances throughout the world, where immense amounts of money have been invested in various enterprises, any legislation that has in it an element of uncertainty as to its ultimate effect, which interferes in any direct or indirect manner with any such enterprise, must have a serious and detrimental effect on the financial situation generally, but more particularly on that particular enterprise. If it is the intention of the Government of Canada to take over this road, even in the manner proposed by the Prime Minister, it still remains the intention of the Government of Canada to take over the operation of the line of railway between Winnipeg and lake Superior, to take that portion out of the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. No such declaration can be made, no such statement can go forward, without having a most seriously detrimental effect upon the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific, because it is thoroughly known that the successful operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific system depends in large measure upon the control by that company of its outlet to lake Superior by reason of its ownership of the terminals and of the line, and of its arrangement for traffic over the part of the line that belongs to the Government. So I say that when we put on our statute-book legislation which, even as amended by the Prime Minister, declares the exclusion of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company from the operation of that section of their system, or of their system and ours, we thereby discredit their enterprise; and by interfering with the successful operation of that enterprise we discredit it not only with those who have invested their money in it but with investors in Canadian securities generally. Because if this Government of Canada and this Parliament of Canada are able and minded to so interfere with the operations of one great enterprise in Canada so they may be minded at some other time or on some other occasion to interfere with some other great enterprise in Canada. I submit that this is a feature of the case that should be given greater consideration than it has been given up to the present time.

I repeat for the purpose of emphasizing it, that the whole Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system, from the Red river to the Pacific ocean, depends for its successful operation upon the control by that system of the outlet to lake Superior.

Mr. COCHRANE: How could they get through without running over the Transcontinental?

Mr. OLIVER: And this Government proposes to put legislation through this House to give the Government authority to exclude the Grand Trunk Pacific from the operation of that section of the road. In answer to my hon. friend's question, " how can the Grand Trunk Pacific get to lake Superior without running over the Transcontinental?" I agree that they cannot get to lake Superior unless they run over that road. But let me call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that an essential part of the arrangement in regard to the construction of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton is that any railroad company is entitled to claim running rights over that road, or any part of it, on terms the limitations of which are laid down in the agreement.

Mr. COCHRANE: That was only in case the Grand Trunk Pacific took a lease, under the Act, to run the road.

Mr. OLIVER: I quite appreciate that.

Mr. COCHRANE: Then there would be no dispute. If they take that, we are quite willing.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They have the right to take that under the Act of 1903-4. The Act gives them the power to take temporarily the completed portions.

Mr. COCHRANE: They must take the bitter with the sweet.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not learned in the law and am not prepared to give an opinion as to this or that section, but I know and everybody knows that it was an essential consideration put forward at the time of the passing of the Grand Trunk Pacific Act that the railway to be constructed under that Act should be for the use of any railroad company that saw fit to use it. And I say that for this Government to ignore that

fundamental principle and say: Because we have the authority to ignore it we will ignore it, would be just the same as the proposal to expropriate the property from lake Superior Junction to the lake front, and would be so considered by those who have invested their money in the enterprise and by other investors as well; and would be properly so considered. It would be an absolute breach of faith on the part of the Government in dealing with a great enterprise with which the welfare and prosperity of this country is so essentially bound up. There is no necessity at all for the terms of this Bill as it stands or as it is proposed to be amended by the Prime Minister. If the object to be achieved is merely that the Government shall have a fair opportunity to operate the Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Moncton, and needs this piece of road in order to facilitate that operation, the very foundation of the agreement between the Government and the Grand Trunk Pacific as to the operation of the Transcontinental contemplated the joint use of those tracks, in case of necessity, by more than one railway company. All that the Government requires to do is to take power to lease running rights from the Grand Trunk Pacific or, if you like, to take power to expropriate running rights over that road so that they would have the same opportunity as the Grand Trunk Pacific itself of using those tracks to get to the lake front for such business as they have to handle.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Suppose the Grand Trunk Pacific was not operating the Superior Junction branch at all and that it became necessary for the Crown to operate the road from Winnipeg to the head of the lakes. Does not this give them that power?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly. But the suggestion I have made also gives them the same opportunity, and does not interfere with the Grand Trunk's continuing the operation that it is now carrying on.

Mr. BENNETT: This does not interfere with their present operation.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, it does. If I read the English language correctly this gives the Government the right to acquire, and if it gives them the right to acquire it also gives them the right to exclude the company from whom it acquires that right. It gives the Government the right to exclude the Grand Trunk Pacific from the profitable and useful operation of this branch line, which is their property, and from the profitable and useful operation of the road between Lake Superior Junction and Winnipeg. It is against this evident intention to exclude the Grand Trunk Pacific from that operation that I protest most. I have no fault to find with the Government for undertaking to operate the Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Quebec during the intermediate period. I have no fault to find with the Government for taking authority to expropriate, if they like, those rights and to operate this branch jointly with the Grand Trunk Pacific. But I take every objection to this Government's taking such action as will exclude the Grand Trunk Pacific from the profitable operation of the line between lake Superior and Fort William, which is the Grand Trunk Pacific's own property. I can only repeat that it is an interference with the operation of a great railway system upon whose successful operation depends in a large measure the welfare and prosperity of our whole western country. I cannot think that the Government is well informed in undertaking to put such legislation on the statute book.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend is unnecessarily alarmed. The Government is just as anxious to preserve the stability of Grand Trunk Pacific securities and the credit of the country generally as the hon. gentleman or anybody else could possibly be. We shall have all those considerations thoroughly in mind in connection with any arrangements that we make with the company. Further than that, we have given very careful consideration to the interests of the western provinces of Canada with which this railway system is so closely concerned, and the House may be assured that in any arrangements we may make we shall have the most careful regard for the interests of those provinces.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No one supposes that the Government has any sinister intention against the company; far from it. But the fact pointed out by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), that this legislation may have the effect of injuriously affecting the credit of the Grand Trunk Pacific securities, and the arguments that he has brought forward in support of his contention, are certainly entitled to some consideration. It seems to

me that there is great force in the views he has presented and in the manner in which he has presented them. If this Bill were simply to say that the Government, pending negotiations with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, shall have power to operate the road, there would be no objection at all. But unfortunately the language which was used the other day led one to believe that there was something beyond that. We have the word of the Solicitor General that the Government wanted a weapon—and he used the word two or three times—when they came to deal with the company. Now, if the Government want a weapon, it is because they want to compel the company to do something it does not want to do. Again, the Government is seeking not only power to operate the road, but power to lease the road permanently or temporarily.

My right hon. friend has submitted an amendment which does not altogether satisfy me. I have one which I shall submit to him and which, if it does not prove acceptable, he can take into consideration. I would suggest that a further clause be added to the Bill to the following effect:

Any contract for a permanent lease of the said line, or the acquisition of the same, shall be subject to the ratification of Parliament.

If there is a contract providing only for a temporary arrangement, there is no necessity for coming to Parliament; but if it is in the nature of a permanent acquisition, I think it should be submitted to Parliament for ratification.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no objection to the idea of ratification by Parliament. But the expression "a permanent lease" is not a legal expression, nor do I know precisely what construction would be placed upon it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If you had a lease for fifty years it would be a permanent lease.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Suppose it were for ten years? I would like to know just what that means. If my right hon. friend will send it to me I will consider it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Say a lease pending the completion of the line.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my right hon. friend will send his amendment to me I will endeavour to work it out.

At one o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

135½

Mr. COCHRANE: In reference to the Bill that we were discussing when the House rose, I beg to move:

That the Bill be amended by adding thereto subsection 8, as follows:

8. Any contract for the lease of the said Lake Superior branch for a term of four or five years or for the acquisition of the same shall be subject to the ratification of Parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: That meets my views.

Mr. OLIVER: The amendment as worded still leaves the idea that the Grand Trunk Pacific is to be excluded from the operation of this branch. I think that the purpose of the Government would be served quite as well if such words were used as would not seem to exclude or would not be intended to exclude the Grand Trunk Pacific from the operation of the branch. I would urge that the operation be one of joint operation instead of one of exclusive operation as against the present proprietor of the road.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That would be covered by the conditions of the lease. I have been comparing this section with other similar sections, and I think it is in terms such as are used in cases of that kind. I think the expression "lease or acquire" will meet the idea that the hon. member has in mind.

Mr. OLIVER: That will be entirely satisfactory to me, but I would like to have a word from the Minister of Railways or from the Prime Minister that that was what the Government had in mind.

Mr. COCHRANE: If we wanted to block the Grand Trunk Pacific from going down to lake Superior, we could do so, because we could make unreasonable terms and block the company in many ways; but that is not the desire of the Government. We want to work in harmony with the Grand Trunk Pacific in order to get business.

Mr. GRAHAM: You want their business in the West?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This amendment suits me.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported as amended and amendments concurred in.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

The House again in committee on Bill No. 110, to amend the Dominion Elections Act—Mr. Doherty; Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 4—hours of polling extended —8 a.m. to 6 p.m.:

Mr. PROULX: I beg to move:

That this Bill be amended by adding as section 1 the following, and by changing the numbering of section 1 and the following sections accordingly:

1. Section 70 of the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(h) Any person during the time he is a director of or holds, either directly or indirectly, a controlling interest in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement, expressed or implied, or any unsatisfied claim arising therefrom, with or for or against the Government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for or against any of the officers of the Government of Canada for which any public money of Canada is to be paid."

Clause (d) of section 70 of the Dominion Elections Act says:

Every person directly or indirectly, alone or with any other person, by himself or by interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement expressed or implied with or for the Government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the Government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, during the time he is so holding, or enjoying, undertaking or executing.

When this Act was passed, business was not carried on as extensively by means of joint stock companies as it is now. This Act was passed for the purpose of securing as much as possible the independence of candidates from the Administration of the day. There is an Act on the statute-book to secure the independence of members of the Senate and of this House; but a person, by putting his business in the form of an corporated company and getting a few nominal directors appointed, although he still owns the majority of the stock, can contract with and sell extensively to the Government, as has been done since the beginning of this war. If a private person cannot have a contract expressed or implied with the Government for the smallest amount, why should a person who holds the majority of the stock of a company and who gets big contracts from the Government, be eligible as a candidate for membership in this House? If we want to secure the independence of the candidate, we must amend the Act in the way which I have indicated by my amendment. I presented a Bill to this House some time ago to amend the Act respecting the Senate and the House of Commons, and I hope it will become law later on; but the first requisite will be to secure the independence of the candidate. I have taken advantage of the Bill presented by the minister to move as an amendment my Bill to amend the Dominion Elections Act. I hope the Government will accept my amendment. It is only fair, I think—especially at this time when the Government is purchasing, sometimes without tender, such great supplies of goods—that the independence of candidates, as well as the public interest, should be protected. I do not wish to dilate on this matter; the amendment speaks for itself.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment. Unless we are to wipe out the Independence of Parliament Act altogether, I think this amendment is desirable. A leading shareholder in an incorporated company, that has a contract with the Government, may be in exactly the same position to all intents and purposes, so far as his interest is concerned, as if that contract were with him individually.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The amendment as proposed operates against any director.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand it is against any shareholder holding a controlling interest.

Mr. BENNETT: And any director also. There are in this House, and have been ever since 1867, many men who are directors of companies having contracts with the Government. The hon. gentleman surely does not intend it to apply against all these men?

Mr. PUGSLEY: If he is a director of the company, I think he should be regarded as the same as one having a controlling interest. The fact of his being a director implies that he has something to do with the management of the company.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Take the case of the Senate and the banks.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: But this applies to one who is a candidate only.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is a singular provision that under the Independence of Parliament Act the disqualification applies if the company has a contract for the construction of a public work. I do not know that this is generally known for it is a well-known fact that there are members of this Parliament who are large shareholders in, officers of, and, in at least one case, I believe, president of companies which have contracts

with the Government for the construction of public works. It is a singular thing that when Parliament passed the Independence of Parliament Act it provided that shareholders in companies having ordinary contracts with the Government should not be disqualified, but that this should not apply to shareholders of companies having contracts for the construction of public works. To-day a member of this House who is a shareholder in an incorporated company having a contract for the construction of a public work is disqualified, while a senator who is in that position is liable to a penalty of $200 a day. Yet we know there are gentlemen in this House and in the Senate—at least such is my information—who are in that position.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the position?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Senator Curry is one.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was not asking for the names, but what is the position?

Mr. PUGSLEY: If a man is a shareholder in a company having a contract for the construction of a public work he is disqualified from holding a seat in this House, or if he sits in the Senate he is liable to a penalty of $200 a day. In my own constituency, the firm of Rhodes, Curry & Company, of which, I believe, Senator Curry, a most worthy man, an honour to the whole country, is president, has a contract in my own constituency for the erection of a post office involving a sum of perhaps $300,000 or $400,000. I do not suppose he is aware of the fact that there is such a provision in the statute. It is certainly anomalous.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What statute?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The effect of the proposed amendment would be very far-reaching. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), for instance, is director of a newspaper. I do not know that it is very profitable. If that newspaper gets a little advertising from the Government, that would disqualify him for being a candidate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That would not be a contract for the construction of a public work.

Mr. BENNETT: No, but I speak of the effect of the proposed amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But suppose the hon. gentleman owned the newspaper in his own right, his position probably would not be very different from what it is—I am assuming that he owns the company; but of course, he can speak for himself as to that. I call attention to section 19 of the Act:

> This Act shall not extend to disqualify any person as a member of the House of Commons by reason of his being,—
>
> (a) a shareholder in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement with the Government of Canada, except any company which undertakes a contract for the building of any public work.

Now, with regard to the Senate, section 20 provides:

> If any person, who is a member of the Senate, knowingly and wilfully becomes a party to or concerned in any such contract, he shall forfeit the sum of two hundred dollars for each and every day during which he continues to be such party or so concerned.

Then, subsection 4:

> This section shall not render any senator liable for such penalties, by reason of this being a shareholder in any incorporated company, having a contract or agreement with the Government of Canada, except any company which undertakes a contract for the building of any public work.

I do not suppose that ten per cent of the people—I venture to say, not ten per cent of the members of this House or of the Senate—are aware of that exception. I am sure that the gentlemen whom I suppose we all have in mind, and who occupy high positions, would not knowingly do anything contrary to the law. But I am confident that unwittingly they are violating the law.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think that was inserted in the statute when the Canadian Pacific railway was first in contemplation, with a view to preventing any person interested in that company being a member of Parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But it is made general in its application.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, but I think that was the occasion of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the amendment of my hon. friend from Prescott ought to carry, or else we ought to amend the Act in another particular and make it uniform. It seems absurd, for instance, that a man like my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) whose company might have a contract for hundreds of thousands of dollars for supplies—

Mr. STANFIELD: All through now.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then, the hon. gentleman can take a more disinterested view. I say it is absurd that the company of which a member of Parliament is a member should be disqualified because his company has a contract for $10,000, $20,000 or $100,000 to build a public work, yet he would not be disqualified if the contract were for supplying the Government with lumber or any kind of material, even though the amount might be very much greater.

I think we should make the statute uniform; either adopt the amendment of my hon. friend, or strike out the whole section. I think it would be wise to adopt the amendment; certainly such a provision is desirable in the case of a shareholder who has a large, substantial or controlling interest in the company.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Would you make it apply to every director?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not see why not.

Mr. BENNETT: Many of us are directors representing absent shareholders in an old company; it is merely a nominal position.

Mr. PROULX: A director usually has large interests in the company; even if he has not a controlling interest, he may be induced to come to Parliament to act in the interests of his company. I do not want to reach the ordinary shareholder by this legislation, but I think that a company in which a member of Parliament has a controlling interest should be debarred from contracting with the Government, and that if such company does contract with the Government, no director or person having a controlling interest in it should be enabled to become a member of this House. In the Bill which I presented to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act, I added to the exception respecting the building of a public work, the following:

And except any company of which he is a director or in which he holds, directly or indirectly, a controlling interest.

I hope that the Government will adopt this Bill after they have accepted the amendment which I have proposed to the Dominion Elections Act. I agree with the hon. member for St. John city that if the Government do not want to accept my amendment, they should wipe out the section at present on the statute book with respect to the standing of a person who is interested in a company which undertakes a contract for the building of a public work. There is not as great danger of abuse in permitting a company in which a member of the Senate or of the House of Commons is a shareholder to contract with the Government for a public work, because most of these contracts are obtained by calling for tenders, whilst many ordinary contracts are obtained without calling for tenders, as was the case during the first months of the war. I think the hon. member for Colchester can corroborate what I have said in this respect; he was concerned in a large contract with the Government.

Mr. STANFIELD: And gave good value, too.

Mr. PROULX: I do not doubt it, but I think that all persons should be on an equal footing. If the Government would like to have a certain man as candidate in a certain county, they might offer a large contract to the company of which he is a shareholder, and the candidate might make enough out of that contract to pay his election expenses. If elected, he would not be independent; he would be tied to the Government. The law which is on the statute book to-day was passed to prevent this, but it does not go far enough, and the object of the proposed amendment is to secure the independence of members of the House of Commons and of the Senate.

Mr. STANFIELD: The company of which I am president, and which bears my own name—a company of which I am proud—during last year sold goods to the Militia Department. The first order was given while I was in England, and I knew nothing about it until I arrived home. If this Bill becomes law, I as president of that company cannot be a candidate for election to the House of Commons, and I have several good friends on the other side of the House who would be very sorry not to see me here. Any amendment of this kind would apply to the hon. member for Northumberland, N.B. (Mr. Loggie); his company sold goods to the late Government, and if his party returns to power he will expect to do a little more business with the Government. I appeal to the good judgment of the committee, therefore, not to pass this proposed amendment; perhaps the law could be amended in some other way that would be just as good.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If the Government had received as good value from all the contractors as they received from the

hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield), we would be in a better condition than we are at the present time. I am sure that my hon. friend gave good value, but unforé tunately the same cannot be said of all contractors. But these arguments are not to the point. I am one of those who would be very sorry not to see my hon. friend in the House; if the Tories are successful in electing a candidate in Colchester, I do not want to see any other Tory than my hon. friend; but I hope that a Grit will be in his place next time. The law of the independence of Parliament is a very strict one: men have been disqualified here, because unknowingly and unwittingly, they had a contract with the Government which was a mere bagatelle. I remember the case of Mr. Harry Corby, who in 1891 found that he was disqualified to sit in the House because, unknown to himself, he had been a contractor with the Government. In this country, as in England, the law of the independence of Parliament has been very strictly carried out. The hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) very properly says that if a man can be disqualified for having with the Government a contract which is a mere bagatelle, surely a man who has a controlling interest in a large company ought to be disqualified also.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The proposal of the hon member for Prescott has certain merits which the committee ought to consider very carefully. The extreme case which he very properly puts before the committee is where a man who is interested in a certain business which he has been carrying on in his own name sees fit to incorporate himself, as it were, and to change his status in that way. The hon. member very properly argues that contracts between such a company and the Government are very much the same as contracts between the Government and the person who thus puts himself in the form of an incorporated company. But there is something to be said for the other side of the case. Every one realizes that during the past twenty-five or thirty years there has been a tendency more and more to carry on the business of the country by means of incorporated companies. The best business ability and the best enterprise of the country are frequently represented by persons who have considerable interest in such companies and who, on account of their ability, may be selected to be members of the board of directors.

The question would be whether or not it is desirable in the public interest that all persons of that type and possessing that interest, which might not be a very great one, in an incorporated company, should be excluded from representing the people in this House, or from becoming members of the Senate. I think that side of the case would demand the consideration of Parliament; and therefore I would suggest that the amendment be allowed to stand until it has received a little more attention on the part of the Minister of Justice and his colleagues in the Government, and that we should proceed in the meantime to consider the other sections of the Bill.

Mr. MARCIL: I think it is my duty to call attention to a case that happened in my own experience. One of my opponents was nominated against me while he had a contract with the Intercolonial. I produced the contract to the returning officer and filed a protest. But I was put to the whole trouble of an election campaign while the man had a running contract with the Intercolonial Railway for the supply of ties. I think there should be something in the law that when a man is actually a contractor and the contract can be produced, some means should be taken to prevent that man from being nominated. In my case there seemed to be a loophole of some kind, and we had all the trouble of a campaign, although the man was not competent to be elected.

Mr. DOHERTY: No doubt it would be desirable if that matter could be determined then and there. But the difficulty that would arise is that in order to obtain that end the returning officer would have to be empowered to determine the question whether a man nominated was a qualified candidate. There might be such absolutely simple cases as the hon. gentleman suggests, but in many cases the determination of the eligibility of a candidate would involve very considerable investigating.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Might not an oath be required of the candidate that he was qualified to be a candidate? For instance, if he were a postmaster he would not be able to take the oath.

Mr. DOHERTY: That suggestion, no doubt, has merit; but I would point out that an affidavit by any person that he was a qualified candidate would involve his swearing not only to questions of fact but to questions of law. If he simply

swore to his interpretation of the law he could not be convicted of perjury. Of course, if all of the causes for disqualification were set out in the affidavit and he had to swear only to questions of fact, then if he made a misstatement in his affidavit he could be subsequently proceeded against for perjury.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think in the New Brunswick statute they have such a provision.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Has the hon. member for Prescott looked up legislation in other countries to see if there is any of the character which he proposes?

Mr. PROULX: No, I have not searched the legislation of any other country; but it struck me that if the purpose of the Act was to secure the independence of members of this House and of the Senate, and of all candidates, as business is carried on nowadays very largely by means of companies, we should make some effort to reach those who control an interest in ary company having a contract with the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose the object of the Independence of Parliament Act is to make it secure that any dealing a member may have with the Government will not influence him as a member of the House. Under modern conditions it is possible that the entire Act should be revised. As has been pointed out, the business of the country is largely carried on by companies. Men group themselves together instead of acting singly as in years gone by. If this suggestion were carried out to its ultimate conclusion it would exclude every man who is a director or owns a large number of shares in a company. This would exclude some of the very best men in Canada from taking any part in public life. Ten men would be excluded under present business conditions to one who was excluded under former conditions when business was carried on individually. Let us take an example. My hon. friend fom Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was mentioned. There are others who are in the same position. The reading room would not be complete without certain newspapers; that is admitted by every person; yet not a single copy of a newspaper could be subscribed for if the proprietor of that paper or a man holding stock in the company happened to sit in the House. Now, that is not the intention of this legislation. That would be absurd.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: These things are so complex that it is difficult to get legislation that will accomplish the object.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, without going to absurd lengths. The question is of such magnitude that it cannot be decided in an hour or two. It should be considered very maturely, not for an hour, but perhaps for a year, in order to find out how present conditions may be met by legislation that will be up to date; for certainly the old legislation does not apply to present conditions.

Mr. PROULX: If my hon. friend objects very much to the directors being reached, I can forego that portion of the Bill and include the words "one who has a controlling interest" so as to prevent a man from evading the law by putting his business in the form of a company.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that could be very easily got around. I am not taking strong ground one way or the other. I am simply pointing out that the matter is far more complex than might appear on the surface. As to directors, it is a well known fact that many men are willing to put a large amount of money in a certain business, provided John Smith will become a director. There are many men who will take stock in a company if a certain man in whom they have confidence is made a director. This director might only hold one share, or just what was sufficient to qualify him as a director. This legislation would exclude that director from being a member of this House, although the only interest he had in the business was his salary and this one share.

Mr. LOGGIE: A man might hold 49 per cent of the stock of a company and sell goods to the Government, while the man who held 51 per cent could not sell the Government a box of matches.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It occurred to me while the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) was speaking that there might be a good many cases that this would not cover. For instance, the general manager of an important company might be paid partly by salary, and partly by a percentage of the profits. That man would be just as directly interested in the company as any one of the directors, perhaps much more so, and yet the legislation of my hon. friend would permit him to be a member of Parliament, while a director having an insignificant interest in the company could not become a member of Parliament.

Mr. PROULX: I suppose that the general manager is nearly always a director too.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Not always.

Mr. PROULX: We can add the words "general manager, secretary, or any officer or employee of the company."

Mr. CASGRAIN: Would my hon. friend define what he means by controlling interest? Is that defined in his amendment? I know of companies in Montreal where the controlling power is held by one man who apparently does not own more than one or two shares; but nothing can be done in that company without his consent and participation. What they do is to nominate their employees to be shareholders or directors of the company. These employees hold the shares, but their employers of course have the controlling power. How are you going to get over that difficulty? I agree with the hon. member for South Renfrew that it is a very complex question and one that cannot properly be discussed across the floor of the House. I think it should be debated in a small committee. Before deciding what should be done I think we should examine the legislation of other countries. This question must have come up in England for instance, but I am not aware that in England anybody who is a member of a company or a shareholder or even a director cannot be a member of the House of Commons. I am aware that when such a man becomes a minister, the Prime Minister, generally speaking, asks him to resign his directorate or whatever position he holds in the company. That would lead me to believe that in England, where they have a very good system as every one will admit, even the director of a company is not prevented from becoming a member of Parliament.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that in the United States in connection with the larger corporations, such as railway companies, they have had in recent years a system that is called a voting trust, whereby certain persons accept the beneficial ownership in the shares upon condition that the voting power shall reside elsewhere. It would not be a very difficult thing to apply a system of that kind to companies in this or any other country. Then you would have the result that persons having not the beneficial interest, but the voting power, could be members of Parliament, while persons having the beneficial interest but no voting power would be excluded from Parliament; and that would defeat the object which the hon. member for Prescott has in view and which I agree is a very laudable object. All these considerations seem to indicate, as the hon. member for South Renfrew has said, that this is not a matter to be disposed of hastily. It should receive very careful consideration, and, as my colleague the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) has said, we should also examine any legislation on the same subject in other countries enjoying similar institutions.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Ontario Legislature amended their Act a few years ago to exclude certain classes of business, and they limited the amendment. I forget the details, but an amendment of that kind was passed some years ago.

Mr. OLIVER: I should like to ask if, after all, it is really a crime to be a member of Parliament or to be engaged in business? From the trend of the discussion that has taken place, it would almost seem that there was a crime more or less concealed in one or the other of these vocations. Unfortunately in this country almost everybody is engaged in business. We have no class of people who are altogether dissociated from business, and can give their time and attention solely to political affairs. We are a country of men engaged in active business life, and a very large majority of our people are struggling with difficulties. But we have to take the country as we find it, and it is from these people that we have to pick the men who will manage our political affairs. Are we going to pass legislation that will render that practically impossible? I take it that the first essential is that, for service in a legislative capacity, we should get the most capable men that the country affords. While I quite agree that there must be restrictions, I submit that it is not in the interests of the country in any degree to prevent the best brain we have and the highest character and the greatest experience, from entering the field of public service in a legislative capacity.

Mr. DOHERTY: As this Bill is the product of the committee, I may say that we had before us a very large number of suggested amendments to the Dominion Elections Act. I think that, without at all minimizing the importance of this suggestion many of those were more important and more pressing than this present suggested amendment can be. After giving these dif-

ferent matters our consideration, I think I will speak correctly on behalf of the committee when I say that in view of the many things that might properly be dealt with in the Dominion Elections Act, and in view of the fact that what seemed to us more urgent and more pressing was that we should get better machinery to enforce the law than we have, we rather reached the conclusion only to suggest the few simple things in regard to the Dominion Elections Act which we have submitted and to look to Parliament this session, at all events, for an improvement in the law mainly in the direction of improving the machinery for enforcing the law we have. I quite agree in what has been said about the necessity of careful consideration being given to the present suggested amendment. Its effects might be very far-reaching and you might reach one class of people and allow to escape another class of people against whom the very same argument might be made. I notice that this proposed amendment is limited to people who have a controlling interest. If I understand it correctly this amendment was introduced for the purpose of making the law consistent, the argument being that, inasmuch as we deal with the individual and exclude him if he has a contract, we ought to exclude people who are interested in companies which have contracts and who are directors or who have the controlling interest. In many companies you may have shareholders who have by no means a controlling interest, but who might have their entire fortune invested in the stocks of these companies. A man in that position has his all at stake in that company and it seems to me that he has just as direct an interest—perhaps more direct an interest—than the man who may have the controlling interest, but who also may have other interests and other sources of income. At first glance it would appear to me that if it is desirable to do this we ought to draw the line somewhere else than between the man who has fifty-one per cent of the shares and the man who has only forty-nine per cent of the shares. If it is desirable it ought to go further. As to its desirability, I must confess that there is room for a little reflection and I think there is no pressing necessity at the present time for dealing with this question in the manner in which it would have to be dealt with under the circumstances.

Mr. PROULX: I thought we might have an election before another session, and I thought this was an opportune time to present this amendment.

Mr. DOHERTY: Great foresight.

Mr. PROULX: If I withdraw this amendment will the Government promise that there will be no election?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand this matter will be allowed to stand for the present. Speaking with regard to the question of requiring an affidavit of qualification, and with regard to the objection raised by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) who cites a case wherein he says it is quite a grievance, I find that I was right as to the province of New Brunswick. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) will probably remember that we have in New Brunswick a provision of the law which is in accordance with what was suggested to the Minister of Justice. The law is in these words:

4 p.m.

> If the qualification of any candidate is questioned, it must be done on or before two o'clock of the day of opening the election, and the sheriff shall give the candidate or his agent, or some one of the persons signing his nomination paper, immediate notice thereof, and unless the necessary declaration of qualification, as in the form (H) in the schedule, is made by the candidate or an elector for him before the sheriff, and filed with the sheriff by two o'clock of that day, he shall not enter his name in the general poll-book.

That would in all probability meet the difficulty which my hon. friend from Bonaventure referred to.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think the question was ever raised in New Brunswick.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, I have known a declaration to be required. I know that in the case of one of the postmasters who was disqualified the objection was raised.

Mr. PROULX: I see a provision in the Ontario Election Act that no person shall be ineligible as member of the Assembly—

> By reason of his being a surety or contractor or liable for the payment of money for or on account of the maintenance or tuition of an inmate or pupil of any Government institution;
>
> By reason of his being a postmaster elsewhere than in a city, town or incorporated village, or interested in a contract for carrying the mail between two or more post offices neither of which is in a city, town or incorporated village or of his being the surety of any such postmaster or contractor;
>
> By reason of his being a surety for a public officer or Ontario land surveyor or other person required by the law to furnish security to the Crown.

But there is also this provision:

A person elected a member of the Assembly, who is at the time of his election a surety as aforesaid, shall, before he sits or votes therein take and complete such action as may be requisite to relieve him from any thereafter accruing liability in respect of his suretyship, and no person who is liable as such surety in respect of any accruing matter shall sit or vote in the Assembly.

If a person were elected to this House, and there was a disability or disqualification existing, he would have to remove this disqualification before taking his seat.

On the question being put: Shall the amendment be agreed to?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understood it was to stand.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is nothing else in the Bill to stand. I do not want to unduly press the matter, but if the committee were ready to deal with it now there would be some advantage in doing so.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did suggest that it should stand for consideration, and I am perfectly willing that it should stand if my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) thinks it desirable. Since the discussion has taken place, and particularly in view of some of the considerations which my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has put forward as to the complexity of the question and the difficulty of determining it in so short a time, I would be perfectly willing to have it dealt with now, but on the other hand I do not object to have it stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If the Government is not going to accept the amendment there is no use of pressing it, and we might as well dispose of it now. My hon. friend (Mr. Proulx) knows that if the Government does not accept it, there is no use of pressing it.

Mr. PROULX: No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If the Government will not accept it let us dispose of it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have a great deal of sympathy with the purpose which the hon. gentleman has in view, but I see a good deal of difficulty in framing legislation to accomplish that object without going so far as to bring about inconveniences and difficulties which might outweigh any advantage which might be derived from any such amendment.

Mr A. K. MACLEAN: If in the meantime the Government see that the legislation proposed is justifiable or wise, they might attach it to the Bill when it goes to the Senate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would be very glad to bring it to the attention of the leader of the Government in the Senate, and also to confer with the Minister of Justice in the meantime to see whether he could prepare a draft which would satisfy to some extent at least the purpose which the hon. member for Prescott has in view, and at the same time not raise the difficulties which have been pointed out in this debate.

Amendment negatived on division.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister considered the suggestion I made in regard to the county of Gaspé? The reason no longer exists for deferred elections in that county.

Mr. DOHERTY: When the hon. member spoke to me before, I had hoped to be able to gather some further information. I placed reliance upon the information furnished me by the hon. member, but I hoped to be able to communicate with other gentlemen in the county. I regret that I have not succeeded in doing so since the hon. member raised the question, and at present I am not much more prepared to go on with the subject than I was at that time. I am quite prepared to say that the more we can reduce the number of deferred elections the better it will be. If this matter of Gaspé had come to the attention of the committee we would have looked into it; but, as I explained before, the way this clause with regard to deferred elections came before us was upon a representation that there had been changes made in certain of the counties in which deferred elections were provided for, and that those changes would necessitate the changing of the designations of those particular counties. When we came to make those changes, we reached the conclusion that it would be quite possible as regarded portions of those counties which became new constituencies not to re-enact the provision for deferred elections; but the question of deferred elections in other constituencies was not brought before the committee at all.

Mr. MARCIL: The late member for Jacques Cartier spoke of the case of Gaspé and strongly urged that it should be brought into line with other counties. Formerly Gaspé was a very remote part of

the province of Quebec, but now Gaspé Basin is reached by train daily and I think the general consensus of opinion of the whole county would be to have the voting on the same day. In the provincial elections, sometimes the nomination is fixed for an earlier date, but the voting is all done on the same day. It is too late, however, to do anything this year.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, amendments concurred in, and Bill read the third time and passed.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 109, to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act—Mr. Doherty; Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

Mr. DOHERTY: This Bill stood for further consideration of sections 4, 5 and 10. The questions that arose with regard to sections 4 and 5 are practically the same. Section 4 prescribes the form of the petition and what shall be required to be contained in the petition protesting the election, and section 5 makes similar provision for the form and what shall be required to be contained in the counter petition. The matter, with regard to which there was some difference of opinion in connection with these two clauses and which gave rise to a desire that they should stand, was that the petition contained in them required that the petitioner should give such particulars as might be necessary to prevent surprise or unnecessary expense to the respondent and insure a fair and effectual trial. Objections were made to the sections as they were proposed; and although we have not been able to have a complete meeting of the committee which submitted the Bill, those of us who could gather together have considered the objections and endeavoured to find a course to meet them. I am afraid I cannot say that we are quite agreed as to the proper method of meeting the objections. I would like to suggest this as being an improvement and, it would seem to me, going far enough to obviate the inconveniences that it was suggested might result from this requirement. If I understood it rightly, the objection most insisted upon to the requirement was the difficulty of defining just what would be covered by such particulars as are necessary to prevent surprise and insure a fair and effectual trial, and more particularly the difficult position that might be created, if the parties, in the absence of special provision for obtaining further particulars or otherwise modifying the petition, found themselves in a situation where the question of the sufficiency of the particulars would arise only at the trial. To obviate that, I think these two provisions should be amended so as to provide in substance, that within a limited delay—I would suggest five days after the service of the petition—either of the parties might make application to the judge to summarily determine the sufficiency or insufficiency of the particulars set forth in the petition. And in the event of finding the particulars insufficient, the judge should have power to order such further particulars as he might prescribe and if the judge arrives at the conclusion that the particulars in the petition are not sufficient, the furtner particulars that he prescribes shall be furnished within a further delay of five days from the making of his order. In that way you have a delay, at the outside, of ten days from the service of the petition.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Sections 4 and 5 of this Bill present many difficulties. If it were possible to frame an amendment to attain the end which the committee had in mind, and which the Minister of Justice also has in mind, I am sure it would meet with the approval of the House. But I must confess that upon reflection, I see objections to section 4, and difficulties in its language, which did not strike me as forcibly when we were considering the Bill in committee as they do now in view of the criticisms that have been made. Perhaps it would be well that the committee should understand clearly just what the purpose and effect of section 4 of the Bill is. Let me call attention to section 11 of the Controverted Elections Act as it is now on the statute book:

> The petition presented under this Act may be in any prescribed form; but, if or in so far as no form is prescribed, it need not be in any particular form, but it must complain of the undue election or return of a member, or that no return has been made, or that a double return has been made, or of matter contained in any special return made, or of some such unlawful act as aforesaid by a candidate not returned, and it must be signed by the petitioner, or all the petitioners if there are more than one.

Under the practice that has grown up in the trial of petitions under the Controverted Elections Act, the petitioners make general charges against the respondent, and as was stated by the Minister of Justice, the petition recites the

language of the several prohibitory sections of the Dominion Election Act—those sections which make certain acts corrupt acts. This is open to objection. It is unfair, in a certain sense, that the petitioner may file a petition charging the respondent with the violation of every section of the Elections Act, though, perhaps, he has at the time no evidence of the actual violation of these provisions. Further, it is obviously irritating to the respondent and to his friends to be charged with the violation of practically every feature of the Elections Act when possibly the petitioner had in mind only the violation of one or two sections. These are the objections to section 11 of the Act which the committee had in mind when it attempted to modify the same, and it was to overcome these that section 4 of the Bill was drafted. Let me read section 4:

4. Section 11 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"11. The petition presented under this Act may be in form "A" in the schedule to this Act. It must complain of the undue election or return of a member, or that no return has been made, or that a double return has been made or of matter contained in any special return made, or of some unlawful or corrupt act or acts, and shall contain such particulars of the complaint set out in the petition as may be necessary to prevent surprise or unnecessary expense to the respondent and to insure a fair and effectual trial; and it must be signed by the petitioner, or all the petitioners if there are more than one.

Thus, the amendment requires that the petition shall contain particulars of the complaint, whereas under the present section of the Act the complaint is set forth in general terms only. Now the word "particulars" in the law respecting election trials has a meaning that has been fixed by the rules of the election courts in Canada and in England. It is well to know what "particular" means, and how comprehensive the term is according to the decisions of the courts. The draftsman of section 4 used in the latter part of it the phraseology of the definition of particulars under the Controverted Elections Act as contained in the English petition rules. Rule 6 is as follows:

Evidence need not be stated in the petition, but the court or a judge may order such particulars as may be necessary to prevent surprise and unnecessary expense and to insure a fair and effectual trial in the same way as in ordinary proceedings in the Court of Common Pleas, and upon such terms as to costs and otherwise as may be ordered.

Therefore we have incorporated in section 4 the English definition of particulars, according to the rules followed in controverted election cases in England. Hon. gentlemen know that particulars in election cases are exceedingly minute and definite. I have in my hand a textbook on the English Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Acts, by Jelf, and, in a form to be used in the giving of particulars, I find that the following particulars are required where the plaintiff alleges payment of expenses by the respondent: number of particulars, charge, date, name of voter, registered number of voter, district, particulars, by whom alleged to have been paid, and so on. It will be seen, therefore, that in Canadian election courts, as in England, "particulars" has a certain significance as a well-settled term, and if we pass clause four as it is, its effect will be that the petitioner will be required to put in his petition the smallest details in connection with the several complaints which are made. I do not think that the committee had this in mind, and in that view I think I shall in this be supported by the Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Calgary and the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick. We had in mind the formulating of some enactment which would compel the granting of more particulars than are required by section 11 of the Act, but I do not think it was the intention of members of the committee that we should go so far as to say that the petition should contain particulars which, as understood in practice would be practically pleading evidence. I think the members of the committee will all agree that it was never intended that we should in our election petitions plead particulars, as is done in controverted election cases. A person might decide at the last moment to file a petition, and it would hardly be fair to require that evidence should be pleaded, or that the complaint should set forth all particulars. I am afraid that if that were the case, the Act would become almost a greater nullity than it is to-day. The trial of an election petition is not like the trial of an ordinary issue in court. The jurisdiction to try election cases, as was pointed out the other night, originally rested with Parliament, and that jurisdiction was handed over to the courts. The trial of an election petition, therefore, is more in the nature of an inquiry or investigation, and I think that it would be hardly proper to insist upon particulars in the petition. I am of the opinion that it would be better to drop this section, and either restore the old section or make

it perfectly clear that it is not intended that the petitioner must set forth what is really evidence. If there is any amendment which we could frame which would make that sure, I should be content. The hon. member for Calgary suggested to me privately to-day that his sense of that section is that the petitioner may allege that in a certain district the respondent or his agent committed certain offences at certain times. While it is possible to give it that interpretation, it is extremely doubtful whether that is the whole scope of the section. I am sorry that I do not see my way clear just at the moment to accept this section as it is; I am afraid that it does not express what was really the intention of the committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What was the intention of the committee?

Mr. MACLEAN: The intention of the committee was, in some way or other, to compel the giving of further particulars than are now required, but it was not the intention to require the pleading of evidence.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What objection is there to leaving the present provision as it is, which gives the judge power to order particulars?

Mr. MACLEAN: I am rather of opinion that it would be bettter to restore the old section. It would create less difficulty than might arise from an attempt to amend it, for the time being at least.

Mr. DOHERTY: The objection to the provision as it stands now is that whereas you require a man to file his petition within forty days, you allow him to do that by a document that conveys no idea to the respondent of what the grounds are upon which he is attacked. What he does know is simply that an election petition has been filed against him. Then, as it works out in practice, the petitioner is enabled, under the present proceedings for the furnishing of particulars, to make his real case six months or perhaps a year later, after he has endeavoured to find out whether he had any reason at all for filing a petition. To me that seems radically unfair. I quite agree with the hon. member for Halifax that the committee did not have in mind that we should require particulars in the sense that we should require the name of every man who may have done an act, and so on, but I am disposed to insist, so far as I reasonably may, upon this section, or upon such modification of it as may meet the serious objection which has been suggested by the hon. gentleman; because I think that this is the one section of this Bill that seeks to remedy a present condition in the law which is very unfair to the respondent. The other provisions of this Bill all tend to deprive the respondent of means of defence available to him under the present law, means of defence which we think he ought to be deprived of, because they lead to great delay, which delay ultimately operates to defeat the practical operation of the law. But we felt that we were the more justified in depriving the respondent of these means of thwarting the petition that the present law now gives to him, if we did at the same time remedy that law where it seemed to us to be unfair to him. The result of that view of this Bill would be that if these clauses be dropped, then our Bill would be one that would operate entirely to further facilitate the petitioner, to place the respondent in a more difficult position. That seems to be unfair to the respondent. Speaking for myself individually, I would almost feel that if we cannot pass these clauses, or something analogous to or approaching them, something more closely attaining the idea of the committee, as the hon. member for Halifax expressed it to have been, then perhaps the whole Bill ought to be dropped. I realize the force of what the hon. member for Halifax has said with regard to the possible interpretation that may be put upon the word "particular," as used in this section, by reason of the established practice regarding the requirement of particulars; and the section will overshoot the mark, I am prepared to admit, if it should be interpreted as requiring in a petition all these things which in practice appear to be required in a bill of particulars. If I correctly apprehend the present condition of jurisprudence, the courts in effect require every detail of each particular act committed, including the individuals who were parties to it, either as bribers or as bribees, or in any other capacity. It occurred to me, while the hon. member for Halifax was speaking, that possibly we might obviate that better if we adopted some form of expression that would not involve the use of the word "particulars," and at the same time would require something more specific in the setting forth of the grounds alleged in the petition. I tried to put this into words, and it seems to me that possibly the objection raised by the hon. member for Halifax might be met if, instead of demanding, as the section now does, such particulars of the complaints set out in the petition as may be necessary to prevent

surprise and unnecessary expense on the respondent, and insure a fair and effectual trial, we should say:

And shall specify the grounds of such complaint sufficiently in detail to prevent surprise or unnecessary expense to the respondent and to insure a fair and effectual trial.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will it be possible to specify grounds of complaint in such a way as to afford no assistance whatever to the respondent? Is there any way of specifying the grounds of complaint, other than in the usual way of furnishing particulars, which will be of any use to him? That is the gist of the whole question?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am disposed to think that one might have considered that the furnishing of particulars did not require as minute details as appear to be required, in practice at all events, in the giving of a bill of particulars. What struck me in the argument of the hon. member for Halifax was that as we are using the word "particulars" and requiring particulars there may be serious ground to apprehend, as he suggested, that the courts may take that up and say: Well, that now means precisely what we have been holding to be required in a bill of particulars; it is the very same word. It seems to me that we would obviate that argument anyway, our requirements would be something else than that. I do not pretend now to be able to define just what extent of specification would attain the desired end. We have to put upon the courts the burden of determining what degree of particularity would be necessary. I think we sufficiently indicate that we do not mean to require a bill of particulars in the petition, and we would have to leave the courts to determine what degree of specification would be sufficient to prevent surprise.

Mr. CARVELL: I have not had the privilege of listening to the discussion so far this afternoon, but it does seem to me that the Minister of Justice has described things exactly as they occurred in the committee. The committee certainly did not intend to recommend words to the House which would entirely obviate the necessity of going to a judge and demanding particulars, as is done under the present practice of the courts; we specifically did nothing to repeal the section. The practice regarding particulars is established by the rules of the courts, and I presume is pretty well known all over Canada. The rules are provided for under sections 85 and 86. I remember that I suggested in the committee that we should put in the word "general" between the words "such" and "particulars" in the tenth line. If I remember correctly, it was the understanding of the committee that we should take somewhat the same position as is taken in regard to a statement of claim in an ordinary suit in court. That is, you must acquaint the respondent generally with the case you are bringing against him, so that he may be in a position to file a general answer. If further particulars are required the present rules allow a respondent to apply for them and get them. Personally, I think the suggestion made by the minister is a good one. There would then be no necessity for using the word "particulars" which has a legal meaning at the present time. Like the minister, I cannot say how the court would interpret the word "particulars". I certainly think that a respondent should have a pretty general knowledge of the complaint that is being made against him. I am anxious to see the Bill go through, and personally I have not very much fault to find with what the minister has suggested.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I also want to see the Bill go through, but if we enact the provision which requires the particulars to form a part of the petition, then if the judge should be of the opinion that the particulars are not sufficient the whole petition would go by the board, and the whole proceeding would be void. Why not leave the present section as it is, and provide for a further time, say five or ten days after the service, in which the particulars can be furnished? Then you do not make the particulars an essential part of the petition. What I am afraid of is that if the judge decided the particulars were not sufficient he would simply dismiss the petition. The minister says that it is unfair to allow a petitioner to get information after he has decided to file a petition, but I am not quite sure whether that is reasonable. The man who buys votes does not do it openly; he goes quietly and in secret to the men whom he wants to influence, and makes an arrangement with them. As a rule, it is not until two or three weeks or a month after the election is over that the information begins to leak out which will enable the petitioner and his agents to support the petition. We should not be too strict in reference to the petition. If the respondent is guilty of a corrupt act, you are doing no

injustice if you allow the petitioner a reasonable opportunity of establishing these corrupt acts. I think we had better leave the section as to petitions just as it is.

Mr. DOHERTY: Perhaps the suggestion of the hon. member might meet what is required, but we should have to make it imperative that the particulars should be given within the time. If we go back to the old provision and require a petitioner to give particulars within five or six days, we shall not be very much improving what the Bill does. It would mean that he would have five or six days longer to give particulars in, than he would have under the Bill as now drafted. If the suggestion of the hon. member would bring about the same results as the provision in its present form, I should be disposed to accept it. I do not know what the views of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr, A. K. Maclean) are on the subject.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am satisfied with the Bill as it is.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So am I.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The object of this Bill is to expedite the trial of petitions. The defendant must be informed as to what he has to answer to. If you do not put that in the petition, you have to give it at a subsequent time. If the particulars are not in the petition, the defendant is entitled to move for them and that means delay. Therefore, I say that the petition should contain everything that the defendant has to answer to. If the petition contains only general terms, so that the defendant cannot prepare a proper defence, that means more delay. I am satisfied with the Bill as it is drafted.

Mr. GERMAN: I notice that the Bill is satisfactory to the leaders of both parties. It is also satisfactory to me, with this exception: If you confine the petitioner to forty days within which he must give particulars of the offences which he intends to prove, you will have mighty few petitions. My observation has led me to believe that particulars cannot be obtained in forty days, especially as regards the large outlying districts, such as the constituency of Nipissing or any constituency in Ontario or Quebec that is spread over a large area. As the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has said, you have to delve to get the particulars on which a petitioner bases his right to an action. I firmly believe that if particulars have to be given, the filing of petitions will be greatly curtailed; and, so far as my reading of criticisms of the Elections Act goes, that is not what the public desire.

They desire that when the petition is filed it shall be tried out, and not traded off against some other petition. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice put in the Bill a clause which says that the judge shall go on. I objected to that because, unless you provide some proper means for the judge going on after the petitioner or respondent has abandoned the case, the word "shall" is inoperative. Unless you provide some means through a public prosecutor, or some other means of procuring the evidence in order that the trial may go on, the provision will be found inoperative. By limiting the time to forty days for the giving of all particulars upon which the petitioner relies you will do away with the filing of petitions altogether.

Mr. PROULX: If the time were lengthened from forty days to sixty days the petitioner would then have more opportunity of looking for particulars.

On section 4—form of petition:

Mr. CARVELL: Before this passes, I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to the fact that in the committee there was some discussion about form A. If the minister will read over form A he will come to the conclusion that it does not cover the real intention of the committee. I think he will find that the form goes very much farther than the section does. The form mentioned would compel the petitioner to give all the particulars and it would render practically nugatory any provision which might exist for the furnishing of further particulars. Form A contains the following:

Here state the grounds on which the petitioner relies, and, in case illegal or corrupt acts are alleged, the particulars of each of such acts are prescribed by section 11.

I would like the minister to consider that for a moment.

Mr. DOHERTY: Would the hon. gentleman's objection be met by striking out the word "each?"

Mr. CARVELL: That would go a long way towards it.

Mr. DOHERTY: "The particulars of each of such acts."

Mr. CARVELL: I very much prefer the suggestion which came from the minister a few moments ago to change the section and change the form to correspond with it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Personally I like the Bill as it was originally drafted. I have been trying to meet the suggestions that have been made, but if we could have agreed upon the Bill as originally drafted I would have preferred it to stand in that way. But I do think that if the section is to be passed as it is drafted, we should add to it something in the nature of what I mentioned at the opening of this discussion this afternoon. I think that we should make provision which would entail a very brief delay but which will afford an opportunity for the determination of the question of the sufficiency or insufficiency of the particulars and one further very brief delay for the petitioner to complete these particulars if they are found insufficient.

Mr. CARVELL: That might cover it.

Mr. DOHERTY: I would move to amend section 11 by adding as subsection 2 the following:

The judge may, on the application of either of the parties made within five days of the service of the petition, summarily determine the sufficiency of the particulars given in the petition, and may, if the same be found insufficient, order the production by the petitioner, within a further delay of five days, of such additional particulars as the judge may in such order prescribe and define; the delays prescribed in sections 19 and 19a shall run only from the date of the decision upon such application, or the date upon which the further particulars ordered are produced, or the delay for their production has expired.

Mr. PARDEE: I suggest that, instead of a further delay of five days, you leave it in the discretion of the judge.

5 p.m. If we put these delays in the discretion of the judge he can grant another delay if the parties consent to it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As a matter of fact, in the practice of any person, have election petitions been delayed for want of particulars? I have never heard of the delivery or non-delivery of particulars being a cause of delay in the trial of an election petition. It is always due to preliminary objections and other delays.

Mr. DOHERTY: If preliminary objections and delays are all wiped out and there are no longer the means of getting delays, then people will reach out to find what other means there are and we will have this question of particulars if we leave it open. We will come back to the preliminary objections and people will be fighting about particulars for months unless we tie it down to a definite time.

Mr. PARDEE: The petitioner might find on the thirty-ninth day that there were certain particulars which were necessary to validate his petition and it might be physically impossible to get these within the succeeding five days. Why should not the judge be given a discretion in the matter just as you do in any other court of procedure where you ask for an enlargement and where the question is left in the discretion of the judge? Why not do the same thing in this case? I think that, as in all other civil cases, it might be left to the discretion of the judge to determine whether or not a longer term than five days should be given. In bringing on an action for trial, if you do not serve your notice within the specified time, you have the right to make a summary application to the judge to go on. If there is no surprise, no prejudice to the other party, it is allowed. Why should you not do just the same in the case of a petitioner who is furnishing particulars in support of his petition?

Mr. DOHERTY: In an ordinary proceeding you are dealing with a fight between two individuals about their own affairs and if they choose to delay indefinitely nobody is hurt. Here we are legislating to correct an evil which is an evil from the public point of view and that is the undue dragging out of election proceedings. If we are going to leave it in the hands of the parties we will get no correction. It is in the hands of the parties now and the result is that these proceedings do not go forward at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister be willing to substitute the word "shall" for the word "may" after the words "given in the petition and"? What I would like made clear is that the judge shall not dismiss the petition because he thinks the particulars are insufficient. The amendment would then read as follows:

The judge may, upon application of either of the parties made within five days of the service of the petition, summarily determine the sufficiency of the particulars given in the petition, and shall, if the same be found insufficient, order the production by the petitioner—

That would mean that the judge cannot dismiss the petition, but must make an order for particulars. That would meet any objection I have.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no objection to making that change.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DOHERTY: As regards the observations of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) in respect to section 4, would his view be met if the words "of each" were struck out, or does his view go further than that with regard to the form?

Mr. CARVELL: That would meet my view.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg to move:

That section 3 of Schedule A be amended by striking out in the seventh line thereof the words "of each" after the word "particulars."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would not the minister require a similar amendment in section 5?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

On section 5—cross-petition:

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg to move:

That the following words be added to section 5:

"The judge may on application of either of the parties made within five days of the service of the cross-petition, summarily determine the sufficiency of the particulars given in the cross-petition, and shall, if the same be found insufficient, order the production by the cross-petitioner within a further delay of five days of such additional particulars as the judge may in such order prescribe and define."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg to move:

That section 3 of Schedule B be amended by striking out in the eight line the words "of each" after the word "particulars."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 10—examination of witnesses.

Mr. DOHERTY: This section gave rise to considerable discussion. It was suggested, among other things, that to some extent it overlapped section 45. I beg to move:

That section 10 be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

Subsection 1 of section 45 is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

"If at any time after the presentation of an election petition it is made to appear to the court or the trial judges that any witness intends to leave Canada and cannot attend the trial of an election petition, or that for any other reason it is desirable in the interests of justice that the examination of a witness be proceeded with forthwith, then an application to the court on notice to the parties to the petition, the court may grant an order for the examination of such witness at a time and place and before a person to be named in such order, and the witness may thereupon be examined touching the matter complained of in the petition, due notice of such time and place being given to the parties to the petition, who may, by their respective counsel, attend such examination, and examine and cross-examine such witness; and such examination shall be reduced to writing and signed by such witness, and when duly returned by the examiner, and purporting to be certified by the examiner, may be used by either party to the petition on the trial thereof."

The only changes in the Act made by this amendment are the following: first, it is made clear that the application for the examination of a witness may be made at any time after the presentation of the petition, instead of, as at present, only after issue is joined or at the trial; second, that the application may be granted not only when the witness is absent from Canada, or may be absent from Canada, but when from any other cause it is made to appear to the judge that in the interest of justice the witness should be examined forthwith; third, that whereas under section 10 as proposed the application for examination might be made ex parte, under the amendment, the application will be on notice to the other party.

Amendment agreed to.

On the preamble:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I desire to call the attention of the committee to a possible further amendment, though I do not propose to submit it as a motion. If the Minister of Justice thinks well, it might be handed to the leader of the Senate. Under the British Corrupt Practices Act there is a provision by which if, by any act or omission by a candidate or his agent, such act or omission not arising from want of good faith, the election law is violated, the party concerned may go to the court and get absolution from the effects of his act or omission. I was engaged in an election in Nova Scotia a few years ago in which the committee—and I myself was a party to it—were responsible for the issuance of a button, a very simple violation of the Act, but a violation nevertheless. Now, under the British Act, in such circumstances, the party responsible for the violation of the Act might go to the court and be relieved of the effect of his action. I think that is a good provision, but I do not propose to move to-day.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

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

Public Works, chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—Quebec—Grosse Isle quarantine station—extension to wharf, $90,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is under contract, is it not?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $75,000.

Mr. BUREAU: The other day I asked the minister a question which was misunderstood. Some work is being done on the old docks in the harbour of Three Rivers, and I asked if the cost of this work was being borne by the Department of Public Works or by the Harbour Commissioners. The Minister of Public Works answered that the docks at Three Rivers were under contract and that the work was being done by Collins and Giroux. That is a coal dock. I wish to know whether any part of this appropriation goes towards paying for such repairs as are now being made in the harbour of Three Rivers, or whether the amount expended by the Commissioners is taken from the revenue of the harbour itself?

Mr. ROGERS: The explanation which I have of this item is that the money is required to make provision for general repairs and improvements to harbour, river and bridge works in the province of Quebec which are under the control of the Public Works Department. A long list of items follows; the item for Three Rivers is $52.

Mr. BUREAU: What is that $52 for?

Mr. ROGERS: That information is not given.

Mr. BUREAU: If the Harbour Commissioners want to carry out any improvements or do any work in the harbour, I understand that they have to get the assent of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. ROGERS: That may be so, for the reason that every board of harbour commissioners is incorporated under a different act. So far as I know, I have never done any business with the Three Rivers Harbour Commission.

Mr. BUREAU: This new coal dock is being built by the Department of Public Works. The Government lease the dock to the Harbour Commissioners for a nominal sum, and the Harbour Commissioners have the management and control of it, but when they want to make any repairs or spend any money on the dock, they have to submit specifications to and obtain the approval of the Minister of Public Works or the Governor in Council, I am not quite sure which. The object of my question the other day was to find out whether such approval had been obtained by the Commissioners of the harbour of Three Rivers for the work that was done last December and January, and what was the nature of the request that was made.

Mr. ROGERS: I will get the information for my hon. friend.

Ile Perrot South—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Has this work been commenced?

Mr. ROGERS: No, apparently not.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it the intention of the department to start pretty soon?

Mr. ROGERS: We have good intentions with regard to all these works.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the good intentions materialize in anything definite in the shape of work?

Mr. ROGERS: I hope that they will.

Mr. BUREAU: Is the hope based on fact, or on mere surmise?

Mr. ROGERS: On fact

Kamouraska—addition to wharf ,$7,000.

Mr. BUREAU: This is a revote; is it the intention to begin the work soon?

Mr. ROGERS: The plans are ready, and we are in a position to call for tenders.

Mr. BUREAU: Will tenders be called for soon?

Mr. ROGERS: I hope so.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. minister's "hopes" are rather vague information for the people who live in that vicinity. The plans are ready and the money voted, and the minister ought to know whether he intends to go on with the work, or whether any future progress depends upon whether or not we have an election.

Mr. ROGERS: The matter of an election will not bear upon it at all.

Mr. MICHAUD: Why was the work not started last year?

Mr. ROGERS: A great many items were passed last June in respect of which the work has not yet been started. We propose to start this year as soon as conditions permit.

Laprairie—protection works, $20,000.

Mr. LANCTOT (Laprairie and Napierville) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken on this item, I wish to make a few remarks concerning the expenditure since 1912 on those protection works at Laprairie. During the session of 1911-12, $15,750 were voted, this amount being seven-twelfths of the full $27,000 which had been placed in the Estimates by the late Government. That vote was frittered away on work by the day during the summer of 1912. During the session of 1912-13, $45,000 were appropriated to the same purpose, namely, the carrying on those improvements during the recess of 1913. In the month of August, 1913, tenders were called for in 38 newspapers of the province of Quebec. That goes to show that the Department of Public Works was not remiss in advertising for tenders towards carrying on those works. Three tenders were put in, one by Mr. E. J. Rainboth, for $70,051.60; another by H. Duranceau and N. Poupart for $72,676.73, and still another by F. C. Jackson for $110,326.23. The minister did not award the contract to the lowest tenderer. Why was that? His reply to my question during the session of 1914 was that Mr. Rainboth was not in a position to meet the wishes of the Department of Public Works, who wanted 1,400 feet of that road to be completed immediately—I should explain that these 1,400 feet had to be completed during the fall of 1913, so as to connect that piece of road with the King Edward boulevard. The minister stated that as Mr. Rainboth was unable to comply with the request of the department and build those 1,400 feet of road immediately, while the next lowest tenderer was ready to go on, he, Mr. Rainboth, on that account, asked leave to withdraw his tender. That was a scheme for the purpose of putting aside Rainboth, and entering later into a private agreement with Duranceau and Poupart. Now, what are the actual facts as they come out to-day? Have Messrs. Duranceau and Poupart signed their contract? No, Mr. Chairman. Have they constructed that piece of road, as requested of Mr. Rainboth, by the minister? No, Mr. Chairman, I know that every one in Laprairie and Napierville would have been glad if that piece of road had been completed in the fall of 1913. Unfortunately, we have been deceived; the second lowest tenderers could not carry on the works any more than Mr. Rainboth could have done himself. Now, the Minister of Public Works will allaw me to inquire whether he has a letter dated the 23rd of October, 1913, from Hon. Mr. Caron, Minister of Public Roads for the province of Quebec, in which it is pointed out that the Dominion Government has still a good deal of work to do on that piece of road which is in the extension of the King Edward boulevard; that nothing has been done during the summer and that the writer could not see how that piece of road could be opened in the spring of 1914. Was it not further stated in that letter of Hon. Mr. Caron that the Provincial Government would complete its part of the work in a couple of weeks if the temperature proved favourable. The Provincial Government spent a good deal of money on that road, and is anxious that the whole road should be ready by next spring, so that it may be an attraction for American tourists, and a convenience for the farmers of the South shore, whom it will enable to proceed to Montreal at all times of the year. In that same letter, the Hon. Mr. Caron made the proposal to the Minister of Public Works that he, Mr. Caron should have the whole road built himself, according to the Estimates of his own engineer for the district of Montreal. The Provincial Minister further stated that he was in a position to construct the dam, the raising of the road with earth and the rip-rap revetment on each side, and complete the whole by the end of June, 1914. And lastly, he put himself at the minister's disposal to make arrangements to determine the cost of this piece of road. How was this offer received by the Minister of Public Works? The reply was in effect that the letter of the 21st of the same month (1913) had been duly received, which dealt with the construction of the King Edward boulevard in the parish of Laprairie; that the department had only lately invited tenders for the work and that there was at the time before Council, a recommendation to award the contract; that the contractor agreed to do the work by the ensuing fall; that, were it not that so much had already been done with a view to let out the contract, the minister would have been pleased to discuss the matter with Mr. Caron.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the actual situation to-day? Messrs. Duranceau and Poupart have not signed any contract pursuant to their tender of $72,678.73; they have not gone on with the work in the fall of 1913; but a new contract was prepared which was more advantageous to the con-

tractors, in that it was a private contract calling for the work to be done by the yard, and not, as was stipulated in the first contract, at a certain fixed price for the whole work. My proof of that fact is to be found in the answer made to a question which I asked in this House on the 20th April, 1914, whether Messrs. Poupart and Duranceau had signed their contract for $72,678.73, the minister, among other things, replied by this statement:

	A cubic yard.
Earth filling	$ 40
Reinforced concrete	10 00
	A square yard.
Stone rip-rap	1 50
Bed road, stone foundation	1 00
Roadway, broken stone	25
Roadway, gravel	25

It was therefore obvious that the contract was awarded to Messrs. Duranceau and Poupart at so much a yard and not for a lump sum, as set out in the tender. Will you believe it, Mr. Chairman, after a year and a half, that work has not made any progress. And what is the cause? Patronage, pure and simple. Why was the contract not awarded to the lowest tenderer? Mr. Rainboth is a distinguished civil engineer, well acquainted with that kind of work, while Messrs. Duranceau and Poupart, two good fellows doubtless, are one a tinsmith, and the other an independent gentleman; but neither has any practical knowledge of work of that sort. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Government will have to pay double the amount which it would have had to spend had Mr. Rainboth's tender of $70,057.60 been accepted. An amount at least equal to that sum, if not greater, has already been expended, and everything will have to be done over again this spring. The protection wall which was to be twelve inches thick and bound together with cement, was built of dry stone, field or cobble stone, without any binding; after it was completed, a thin coat of cement was spread over it. Then came the autumn rains of 1914; from night to night some part of the wall crumbled to the ground, sometimes over a length of five hundred, six hundred and even fifteen hundred feet; the farmer and passers-by used to say that the Germans had crept up during the night and effectively bombarded the wall. I am quite aware that the minister and his friends, in order to shield themselves, will put the blame on the district engineer. I am quite aware that some Conservative politicians demanded the dismissal of Mr. Michaud, the district engineer, and put their foot to his throat to prevent him from doing his duty. Those Tories were in no way backward in crying out: Our turn has come to rule; the Liberals have no more anything to do; and as for you, Mr. Michaud, you toe the mark or you will lose your position. Mr. Michaud, as I stated before, should have performed his duty, and even take his dismissal if the Government had gone that far. Very likely we would not see that which now is going on at Laprairie. At the present time, one cannot proceed to Montreal with an ordinary load, and in few days this elevated road will be absolutely impracticable.

I now wish to take up the subject of the temporary road. How much has the Department of Public Works paid for this temporary road at Laprairie?

Hon. Mr. ROGERS: (Translation): $4,000.

Mr. LANCTOT: I may say to the minister that that work could be done for $300. If he paid $4,000 for it he paid just $3,700 too much.

(Translation): I will ask the minister if he intends to make a temporary road this spring and whether it would not be better instead of making a temporary road to make a good macadamized road with a small wooden bridge. That temporary road which has cost the Government $4,000, has not cost the contractors $300; I assert that fact in all sincerity, and the engineer who has recommended the expenditure deserves to be superannuated and given a pension.

I wonder how long such a course will be pursued in respect of public works in our constituencies and how long the people will be deprived of the improvements which ought to be made with the moneys wasted for party ends. I am familiar with what has taken place in my county and the same things holds good for other parts. The politicians it is who see to the distribution of Government patronage and who hold back the works so as to obtain more money for election purposes. Work is undertaken, not for the benefit of the people, but in contemplation of election results. If the minister has to pay as high for public works elsewhere as for the famous temporary road at Laprairie, we may expect to hear of interesting doings from now to election time.

I will ask the minister how much will be required to complete the works? I am informed that the department intends to widen the road and make the wall 36 feet instead of 24. Does the minister intend to comply with that request? I would like to know also whether Mr. Arthur Duford is still an employee of the Government, and

whether he has been employed during the winter as foreman to supervise the work? Has he made any report to the Government, and has he seen to it that the work was carried on according to the plans and specifications?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not a great deal of fault to find with what my hon. friend has said respecting this very important work, because it is undoubtedly a work of great importance, in view of the fact that it is the connecting link of such an important highway to the city of Montreal, and therefore deserves very careful and sound consideration. In respect to the conditions of the contract to which my hon. friend has referred, when we first called for tenders we made it a condition that 1,400 feet of the walls should be finished during that present session. Mr. Rainboth tendered at $70,000, but he refused to accept those conditions, and the next lowest tenderers, who were $2,000 higher, accepted the contract at $70,000, the amount of Mr. Rainboth's tender. It is true that they have not carried out their contract as well as we would have liked and that some delay has taken place and some difficulties have arisen. Mr. Paradis, the engineer in charge, has given the matter a great deal of consideration and he has had difficulties in respect to the engineering problems, just as the contractors have had in respect to their contracts. My hon. friend mentioned the fact that we spent $4,000 for a temporary road last year to make conditions passable there, and he complains that this amount has been altogether too extravagant. That is the statement of my hon. friend; but as against that, with all due respect to him, I may say that in the opinion of the engineers of my department this amount of $4,000 was very well spent and was cheap for the work that we secured for the purpose of making the temporary road. I am giving my hon. friend the report of the engineers of the department, who have had an opportunity of examining the work. In respect to the width of the road which my hon. friend has referred to, I may say that the road as at present laid out is only 24 feet wide, and I do not think it would be possible to change it at present. We are anxious to get the road completed as quickly as we can, and I quite agree that we must have a temporary road that will be satisfactory to the travelling public for the coming year. This will be taken up at once by the department, and I am satisfied we will be able to provide a temporary road immediately that will meet with the requirements of the public that travel from Montreal. I do not know that it will be possible to build a macadamized road as the hon. gentleman suggests, but we will make a road of a temporary character that will be entirely satisfactory and will proceed with the contract as fast as we can. I am going to have a very thorough investigation made of this particular work, because I recognize its importance; and if it turns out that the present contractors are not carrying on the contract in the workmanlike manner they should, I will be prepared to recommend that it be taken out of their hands and to see that the work is built under the direction of the officers of the department, with a view of having it completed at the earliest possible moment. But in the meantime I will make provision for a temporary road that will meet all requirements for the travel in that district.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): I understand from the minister's answer that the contract was not awarded at the bulk sum of $72,000, but at so much a yard. The contractors receive $1.50 per yard for the revetment wall. That easily explains the indifference of the contractors as to whether the wall crumbles to the ground or not. If it does crumble, they only have to put it up again at the same price, and that means a further profit for them. Mr. Duranceau went about saying to all comers: that revetment wall will not stand, but we will rebuild it and be paid for the work. Will the minister stand for this sort of thing very long and allow those gentlemen to plunder the public treasury in that manner? Of course, the public treasury is pretty well drained as it is.

Mr. ROGERS: The conditions my hon. friend has referred to will not occur again.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister stated just now that the contract was let for $70,000. The hon. member for Laprairie-Napierville (Mr. Lanctot) states that last April he put a question on the Order Paper asking how this work was being paid for. The answer was that so much was being paid for concrete, so much for reinforced concrete, so much for rip-rap, so much for gravel, and so on. He wants to know whether the contract price was based on the quantity of these different materials, or whether the contract was let for the fixed sum of $70,000.

Mr. ROGERS: The contract price was $70,000. We arrived at that figure by calculating the quantity of the material and the price per cubic yard.

Mr. BUREAU: The contract was not actually let for $72,000? I suppose the engineers figured out the amount of material that would go into the road at the prices mentioned in the answer given to my hon. friend from Laprairie-Napierville.

Mr. ROGERS: The contract price was $70,000, not $72,000.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): What strikes me as most remarkable in this connection, is that $60,000 have been spent and nothing has been done as yet. That is as clear as crystal. The minister told me, a few days ago, that $49,600 had been spent to date; the farmers, however, have not yet been paid for the stone they have drawn all winter, and that item alone amounts to $15,000. As everything will have to be done over again, I say that the work will cost beyond $70,000.

The minister has not told me whether Mr. Arthur Duford was still in the Government's employ, what was his salary, and how much he has received to date?

Mr. ROGERS: I understand that the inspector is still in the employ of the department, and that he has been on the work during the winter receiving material.

Mr. LANCTOT: How much is Arthur Poupart, the carter, paid a day?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the information here, but it would not be more than $3.

Mr. LANCTOT: Does the minister know that this man Poupart has been working for himself all the year round, and been getting $3 a day from the Government as well?

Mr. ROGERS: I will take that up with our engineers.

Mr. VERVILLE: This road is not in my constituency, but I have had a little experience of it. If the Government are going to spend $4,000 on this road, as the minister has stated, they ought to get a great deal of work done for that money. I am sorry the Government has been fooled so badly over this road. My hon. friend has said that it could not have cost more than $300. I do not know how much it cost myself, but I could have made quite as good a job of it for $300, and made money. I should like the minister to take a drive over that road on a wet day. I saw as many as eighteen automobiles stuck there one Sunday last summer. If the minister goes, though, he should have a team of horses or a truck in front of him, for he is sure to get stuck. I have heard several American tourists, who have come to Montreal over that road complain about it. Some tourists, after getting within a few miles of Montreal, have turned back altogether, thinking that if that was a sample of the roads in the province of Quebec they did not want any more of them. This summer, on account of the disturbance abroad, we expect to get a lot of tourists in Montreal, and we should not like anything to interfere with their coming to our city. I think it would be in the interests not only of the city of Montreal, but of the department and of the whole country, if the minister would take a look at that road on a wet day. He certainly should not let the road be rebuilt by the same contractor.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Public Works—chargeable to income—Laprairie protection works, $20,000.

Mr. LANCTOT: What is the amount required to finish the work.

Mr. ROGERS: I am not in a position to give my hon. friend definite information. It will be something more than the estimate provides.

Mr. LANCTOT: It will cost three times as much.

Mr. ROGERS: No, not as much as that, I hope.

Mr. LANCTOT: Unless you change the contractor.

Mr. ROGERS: We will give you a good road, anyway.

Mr. LANCTOT: I hope so.

Mr. BUREAU: I would like to ask the minister if any definite plan has been agreed upon to make this temporary road complete next season and when the work is going to be done.

Mr. ROGERS: We will start work as soon as possible on the temporary road. We must get that in order immediately. There is no special plan as yet, but the engineer has instructions to get the work done promptly. Representations came from the automobile club in Montreal the other day.

Malbaie—to complete pier, $17,000.

Mr. BUREAU: How far apart are these two wharves mentioned in the items: Malbaie, to complete pier, $17,000; and "Murray Bay—wharf improvement and repairs, $4,400"?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Malbaie is the French translation of Murray Bay.

Mr. ROGERS: This is Malbaie in Gaspé county; it is not the same.

Mr. BUREAU: Is this to complete the work at Malbaie?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

New Carlisle—repairs to wharf, $1,500.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is required to rebuild the slip and repair the mooring posts and planking of the wharf at New Carlisle. The work is necessary in order to put the wharf in a serviceable condition, as it is now in a very dilapidated condition and dangerous to travel. It was asked for by the district engineer, Mr. Taché.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the work be done this year?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Nominingue—wharf, $1,700.

Mr. BUREAU: I see no item in these Estimates for Nicolet. May I ask the minister if the wharf that was being constructed at Nicolet is finished?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, the work is finished, and the final Estimate paid.

Mr. BUREAU: Has the land been paid for? I see in the Auditor General's Report that there is the following item:

Purchase price of right of way, Corporation Episcopal Catholique Romaine, $450.

I understand that there is a lawsuit pending before the Exchequer Court, that proceedings have been taken to expropriate this land and that the amount offered has been refused.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend will be pleased to know that his Lordship the Bishop has accepted our price of $450 without the excommunication of anybody.

Mr. BUREAU: I am glad that my mind has been relieved. I see by a copy of the defence, wherein excommunication was threatened, that there is also another condition placed upon the acceptance of the $450 and that is the construction of a retaining wall.

Mr. ROGERS: We had to do that anyway. That is going on.

Mr. BUREAU: What depth of water will you have at this particular wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: The engineer thinks about nine or ten feet.

North Temiskaming—wharf, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is this to complete the wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: No, the contract and plans are not ready yet.

Paspebiac—wharf repairs, $2,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount of $2,000 is required to renew the planking and place some of the stringers and fenders of the Robin, Jones & Co. wharf. The work is necessary in the interest of trade and navigation as the wharf under existing circumstances does not provide the necessary accommodation. It will be gone on with this year.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the department acquired the Robin Jones wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: No, we are not the owners of the wharf; we are just repairing it for the public benefit.

Mr. MARCIL: There is a public wharf already. Why is that not used?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know. The district engineer, Mr. Taché, in his report of Dec. 27, 1912, states that:

There are two wharves, one belonging to Robin, Jones, Whitman and Company and the other to the Government. This wharf is the most useful on account of its situation and facility of access and the Government wharf, more used as a breakwater, is a great protection against the accumulation of sand and makes the harbour at this point a perfect shelter.

The work is entirely departmental and is done under the recommendation of Mr. Taché.

Mr. MARCIL: Why does the Government spend money on a private wharf or a wharf that belongs to Robin, Jones & Company? That is something new?

Mr. ROGERS: That has been a very common practice of the department for many long years in a very limited way. Where the expenditure of a small amount will be of advantage to the travelling public, re-

pairs are made but not with the view of building a new wharf.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the department been asked to acquire this wharf or has it been offered at any price?

Mr. ROGERS: The wharf has been offered to us but we have not purchased it.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the minister have any objection to stating the price that was asked?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not that information here; I can get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. MARCIL: Will wharfage fees be charged on this wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: No, it has not been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MARCIL: Then it remains a private wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: It would until we bought it, but still there will be no charges to the public for using it.

Mr. MARCIL: This wharf has been built right in front of the property of Robin, Jones & Co., a large fishing firm, and has been used by them as a private wharf for a long time. The people of Paspebiac wanted a public wharf, a public wharf was built and now the department seems to have abandoned that wharf and is spending money on private property. That is rather an ususual departure. Will the work be done this year?

Mr. ROGERS: That is the present intention.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the whole amount to be expended on the wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: I might as well call the minister's attention to the breakwater at Paspebiac which was started some years ago and which was not extended far enough for the use of the fishermen. Paspebiac is the most important shipping point on the Baie des Chaleurs and it is the headquarters of this large fishing firm of Robin, Jones & Co., or, as it used to be called, Robin, Colas & Co. The fishermen look to this breakwater for the protection of their boats. We made a start there and spent, I think, $15,000 under the old Administration. The extension of this breakwater is very badly needed. I do not know whether a request has been made for an extension or not

Mr. ROGERS: We have had no request for an extension.

Petite Rivière Est breakwater, $21,400.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. ROGERS: This is required for the construction of an open-face crib-breakwater 100 feet long, which is required for the protection of the fishermen from western gales. Several requests were received by letter from private individuals on May last. It is all a revote; nothing has been expended.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it intended to go on with the work this year?

Mr. ROGERS: This is like most of the other public works.

Rimouski harbour improvements, $50,000.

Mr. BUREAU: What improvements are to be made?

Mr. ROGERS: The work is under contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will this complete the work ?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the total cost?

Mr. ROGERS: $355,000. There is a stipulation in the contract that we are to spend so much a year until the work is completed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The improvements include dredging?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it intended to have a deep-water wharf for steamers?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, for all ocean ships.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand the main wharf is at Father point and that this wharf at Rimouski is of very little use.

Mr. ROGERS: The Rimouski wharf is the only one used for ocean ships.

Mr. MARCIL: What about Father Point? Is it not there where the pilots and mails are landed?

Mr. ROGERS: The wharf at Father Point is used only for the pilots' ships.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is this to make improvements up the Rimouski river towards Price's mill?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Rimouski wharf renewals and repairs, $3,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the total amount spent on the Rimouski harbour?

Mr. ROGERS: $332,000 has already been expended.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that in addition to the $355,000?

Mr. ROGERS: No, part of that is in this amount.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the minister expect there will be big business at Rimouski?

Mr. ROGERS: There is a good deal of lumbering and trade of that kind.

Mr. MARCIL: I hope the expenditure is justified.

Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) harbour improvement, $50,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is this work?

Mr. ROGERS: This is a very important work, and one that requires a great deal of consideration. When we first considered the idea of making the improvements in this harbour, we did not estimate that its cost would be anything like what it appeared on the report that it was likely to be, and we are having another examination made to see if we cannot get the cost down to a reasonable figure. The present report seems to be altogether too high.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it contemplated to dredge the harbour as well as to increase the wharf accommodation?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. If we go on with the work, it will be absolutely necessary to do some dredging.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The department does not intend to proceed with the work during the present year?

Mr. ROGERS: We are making a further examination, and I do not expect we shall proceed this year.

Rivière du Loup (en haut) lock and dam, $10,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Is this in the county of Maskinongé?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Where is this dam to be located, and what is the object of building the lock?

Mr. ROGERS: The work is with a view of preventing the continual dredging that has been going on there year after year. By this vote we hope to be able to have a finality and avoid the necessity of continual dredging.

Mr. BUREAU: Where will the dam be located?

Mr. ROGERS: At the mouth of the river.

Mr. BUREAU: Below Tourville's mill?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Rivière Laguerre improvements, $15,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is this situated in Chateauguay county?

Mr. ROGERS: It is in Huntingdon county.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the work for?

Mr. ROGERS: For a canal ten miles long, from Rivière Laguerre to River St. Louis. The improvements are necessary to prevent the flooding of 20,000 acres of land. The public works erected at the foot of Lake St. Francis near Valleyfield caused the lake to maintain a higher level and overflow into Rivière Laguerre, causing the river to flood about 20,000 acres of land. The work consists of excavating a canal over 10 miles long and 20 feet wide at the bottom, with slopes of one in one on both sides, from Rivière Laguerre through the marshy lands southeast of St. Anicet, south of Port Lewis and west of Ste. Barbe and St. Stanislas to River St. Louis north of St. Stanislas. It is applied for on behalf of the people of that district.

Mr. MARCIL: Will this amount cover all the work in the district?

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid it will not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When I was Minister of Public Works this work was very strongly urged by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb). It seemed by reason of the vast area which would be reclaimed that it would be a desirable vote. Why was this work not undertaken before? There was a vote last year of $15,000 for it, no part of which was spent.

Mr. ROGERS: We did not seem to have the same amount of freshet last year that we usually have, and as the work was not pressed for so energetically, it was overlooked, but it is very possible it will have to be done this year.

Stratford, Quebec—repairs to wharf, $2,500.

Mr. TOBIN: What are these repairs?

Mr. ROGERS: The amount is required to reinforce the approach to the wharf by filling three spans with solid stone cribs. The work is necessary to avoid the total destruction of the bridge by the moving of the ice in the spring. The approach which was originally constructed is too weak to stand the heavy ice pressure. The repairs have been recommended by the district engineer.

Mr. TOBIN: Will this work be done by day labour or by contract?

Mr. ROGERS: By day labour, I fancy.

Mr. TOBIN: Has anybody been recommended to take charge of the work?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. TOBIN: Does the hon. minister expect to go on with the work this coming season?

Mr. ROGERS: I think we will have to, because of the damage which the ice has been doing to the wharf.

Ste. Anne des Monts—landing pier, $95,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is required to build a landing pier, which is necessary to provide additional landing accommodation for traffic in the neighbourhood. During the present fiscal year, $20,000 was expended in constructing 150 feet of the shore portion of the pier. Contract price, $112,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What depth of water is there at that place?

Mr. ROGERS: About 25 feet.

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière—wharf extension, $6,700.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: This item has been in the Estimates for the last four years. Will the minister tell me whether anything has been done?

Mr. ROGERS: This item has been in the Estimates for five years. Tenders were called for in 1912; apparently nothing has been done up to date. The lowest tender was $4,185. The wharf at that place was built in 1884. I shall be glad to look into this matter; it has not been brought to my attention. It looks as if this work should go on, after waiting five years.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Is it the intention of the minister to call for tenders this year?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Ste. Anne du Saguenay—repairs to wharf, $10,500.

Mr. MARCIL: There are two items for improvements to the wharf at Ste. Anne du Saguenay. Are there two wharves at this place?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the information here, but I will have it to-morrow. We will not duplicate the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That will be all right if the hon. minister sees that only one vote is spent.

St. Germain de Kamouraska—wharf, $10,000.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: This item has been in the Estimates for the last four years. Has anything been done to carry on the work?

Mr. ROGERS: The contract plans are ready; that is all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: During the provincial elections in Quebec in 1912 a certain gentleman in the vicinity of St. Germain de Kamouraska sold a quantity of timber for that wharf to the Department of Public Works. At the following session I asked the minister whether the wharf would be built by the Government, and the minister told me that he would call for tenders and arrange for a contract. He told me also that the contractor would have to buy that timber from the Government. That is four years ago; I should like to know what has been done with that timber.

Mr. ROGERS: I have no information with regard to the timber purchased in 1912.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have the papers; the return was laid on the table last session.

Mr. ROGERS: I have no information that I can give my hon. friend.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would like to know what became of that timber.

Mr. ROGERS: If we purchased any, we would like to know too.

St. Irenée—addition to wharf, $10,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. ROGERS: The amount is necessary to provide proper shelter for vessels, particularly during the winter season. The addition when completed will offer a winter berth for the ferry steamer Champlain and for the icebreakers that go below Quebec. St. Irènèe is one of the few safe winter ports on the north shore of the St. Lawrence below Quebec. When this addi-

tion is constructed it will be used by a great number of schooners which find it difficult to get winter quarters elsewhere.

Mr. MARCIL Before we leave the Quebec Estimates, I desire to call attention to two pretty large items, both revotes and both for the Island of Orleans—two new wharves authorized. Nothing seems to have been done there. Would the minister please explain?

Mr. ROGERS: The plans are not ready yet, and nothing has been done in either case.

Ontario—Brockville harbour improvements, $40,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will this finish the work? I see that $50,000 was spent last year.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, I was at Belleville the other day and was looking at this wharf. It is very satisfactory. This amount will finish it and will build a shed as well.

Burlington—to repay Hutcheson and Latimer the security deposited in connection with their contract for revetment wall, $2,180.

Mr. MARCIL: Is this revetment wall to prevent damage by the wash of the waters of the lake?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why is this vote required if the contractors finished their work?

Mr. ROGERS: The security deposited by the contractors was forfeited. But they come forward and make a very strong case that we should not have forfeited their deposit cheque. It is a matter of long standing.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is a very unusual thing to return a cheque that has been forfeited. The minister ought to give the committee more information than merely to say that the contractors made out a strong case. In such a case as this, I think, it is usual to give the committee particulars.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know that I have any particulars that I can give. I remember that when I visited Hamilton about a year ago, the matter was taken up by the city council and the people of Hamilton generally. It was an open question that injustice had been done in some form to the contractors, and it was claimed that they were entitled to the return of their deposit.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: They failed to carry out their work, I suppose?

Fighting island, Detroit river—improving the channel, $57,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the minister kindly explain this?

Mr. ROGERS: District Engineer Lamb states that the object is to double-track the existing ship canal in the Detroit river by widening and deepening certain parts on the Canadian side of Fighting island, to relieve the congestion of traffic in the American channel. The result will be a channel of a minimum width of 300 feet and a minimum depth of 21 feet. It will be of great benefit and assistance to the traffic passing at this point.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the estimated cost?

Mr. ROGERS: Some $300,000.

Goderich harbour, $200,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will this finish the work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, this is expected to finish the work there.

Kingston harbour—improvements, $150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is quite a large item. Would the minister please explain?

Mr. ROGERS: These improvements were originally asked for by the city council, by the Dominion Marine Association and by the Kingston Board of Trade. The improvements consist of a combined roadway and wharf to replace the existing Cataraqui bridge. Such parts of the bridge as shall be directed are to be removed, retaining walls built, three timber cribs, two at the open for the proposed lift-bridge, and one in the western approach, piers and abutments for two highway bridges and one lift-bridge, etc. When these improvements are finished, the department intends to construct a steel bridge. Kingston is a transhipping point for grain brought down from the Great Lakes and owing to the enlargement of the Welland canal the facilities there now are inadequate and this work is necessary in view of the change in conditions.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does part of this work include the building of a highway bridge at Yarmouth?

Mr. ROGERS: I believe it does.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does that take the place of the toll bridge that has existed there for a long time?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. This has been under way for two or three years.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The question came up when I was minister and I was under the impression that some other arrangements were to be made by the city for the building of the bridge. What was the justification for the building of a highway bridge by the department?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the exact details of the reasons at hand. This contract has been under way for some years, it has already passed the House several times and I shall be glad to look it up and bring to the House the statements made when it was originally introduced.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the minister should inform the committee about this matter as if this principle were adopted the demands on the Federal treasury would be very great. Some few cases of this kind have occurred in the past where highway bridges have been built by the Federal Government when the circumstances have been peculiar. For instance in Manitoba a bridge was built on the ground that was on the boundary line between two provinces, but there was a good deal of criticism even of that. It is a very important subject having reference to the fact that the provinces heretofore have constructed all highway bridges.

Mr. ROGERS: I quite appreciate what my hon. friend has said. I remember when my predecessor brought in this vote there was an explanation that appeared to be satisfactory to members on both sides.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The item might pass and the information be laid on the table.

Peterborough dry dock, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Do the Government propose to build this as a Government work?

Mr. ROGERS: The work is not yet commenced. It is for use in connection with vessels on the Trent Valley canal, a very small dock.

Port Dover harbour improvements, $50,000.

Mr. NESBITT: Has any work been done there?

Mr. ROGERS: The plans are not yet ready and nothing has been done.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Port Dover, I think, has been a private harbour. Has it been taken over by the Government?

Mr. ROGERS: I believe we have taken over the harbour. This is to make improvements.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How much was paid for that harbour?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the information here.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I make no objection to the Government taking it over. I am glad they are doing so. Years ago, probably before Confederation, many of the harbours on the Great Lakes were vested in private corporations. I think that was a mistake. It has proved a detriment to the ports and navigation and the interests of the people and I am very glad that the Government is taking these harbours over. The late Government took over several of them and it is a policy that might be carried out to great advantage with respect to all harbours on the Great Lakes.

Mr. NESBITT: Have the Government as a matter of fact taken it over? The Grand Trunk have control there yet, have they not?

Mr. ROGERS: We have not the information here.

Rainy River—survey and maintenance of gauges, $17,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is that?

Mr. ROGERS: This is an international river and it is a necessary expenditure under our arrangement for the operations at that point.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the minister not think it would be advisable to have all expenditures which come under the jurisdiction of the International Waterways Commission put under head? We have some items, I think, in connection with the Lake of the Woods which seems to be for a similar purpose as that river enters the lake of the Woods and they are really one water so far as international questions are concerned. My criticism is not so much of the amount as of the placing of these items under the Public Works Department.

Mr. ROGERS: This item is due to the necessity of surveys and arrangements in connection with the booming privileges at the mouth of the river. These items do not really come under the heading to which my hon. friend has referred.

Richard's Landing—wharf reconstruction and warehouse, $9,000.

Mr. ROGERS: I beg to move that this item be reduced to $6,000, which is all that is required to finish the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is on Manitoulin island, is it not?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

Sault Ste. Marie—wharf repairs, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will that finish the work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: Could the minister tell me on this item what is intended to be done this year on the Nation river?

Mr. ROGERS: We are asking for $10,000 to complete the improvements on Nation river. It appears that the most satisfactory manner of proceeding with this work will be with teams and scrapers. We cannot use a large plant there of any description.

Mr. PROULX: At what place are they doing any work?

Mr. ROGERS: At Forks, in Dundas county.

Manitoba—Le Pas—wharf, $15,000.

Mr. OLIVER: How much is the wharf to cost? I see there was a vote for $30,000 last year. This year the vote is for $15,000.

Mr. ROGERS: We have revised the plans, and we shall now be able to build the wharf for $15,000.

Red river—improvements, $30,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Are these improvements below the locks or above?

Mr. ROGERS: This work is for the purpose of strengthening the protection work at the new entrance of the mouth of the Red river. This will be accomplished by driving sheet piles over 1,855 lineal feet on the west side, and 1,200 lineal feet on the east side, and placing in the work 1,200 cords of ballast stone. The work is necessary in order to make the protection work of a permanent character. This channel is the only one for traffic between Red river and lake Winnipeg

Red river—St. Andrew's lock and dam—improvements, $22,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the matter with the dam. I understand that the St. Andrew's dam is as bad as the Transcontinental.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. ROGERS: This is to provide for an extension of the north lock wall at a cost of $14,000. Then grading, seeding, sodding and fencing has to be done at a cost of $8,000. The work proposed is the

9 p.m. extension of the north lock wall for a distance of 220 feet, with a return wing of 20 feet.

Mr. OLIVER: These are outside improvements?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was the bridge ever built?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Selkirk—harbour improvements and repair to plants, $10,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What harbour improvements are there at Selkirk? I see there was a vote last year for $100,000.

Mr. ROGERS: We have to provide a harbour for the different steamers on the lakes. A considerable amount of work in that direction was done last year, and I understand it was much appreciated.

Mr. OLIVER: Was the $100,000 spent last year? Will this $10,000 complete the work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Winnipeg Harbour—wharves, $75,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What new work is being done at Winnipeg harbour?

Mr. ROGERS: We are having two or three wharves built at Winnipeg to accommodate the traffic that has developed on the Red river owing to the advantages of the St. Andrew's lock and dam, which have made the Red river very navigable. We had an estimate in last year for $200,000, but did not spend very much of it.

Mr. BUREAU: Where are the wharves located?

Mr. ROGERS: At the foot of Notre Dame street, right in the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Do I understand the minister to say that there has been a very satisfactory increase in traffic between points on lake Winnipeg and the city of Winnipeg as a result of the building of the St. Andrew's lock?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, a wonderful development has taken place there.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am very glad to hear that because there has been a great deal of

doubt as to the desirability of spending so much money there. Greater wharf accommodation at Winnipeg would necessarily result from an increase in traffic.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend is quite right. Hon. gentlemen can expect that when I come here next year I shall ask Parliament for a considerable sum for the development of harbours and wharves in the city of Winnipeg, which will be necessary on account of the increased traffic on the Red river.

Mr. BUREAU: Has that traffic developed only below Winnipeg, or above as well?

Mr. ROGERS: It has developed all the way up the river.

Mr. BUREAU: What kind of boats have they there?

Mr. ROGERS: Some are flat-bottomed and some are not.

Mr. BUREAU: Do they go up as far as Emerson?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. BUREAU: How much of a draught is there above Winnipeg?

Mr. ROGERS: About 14 feet.

Mr. BUREAU: Is that due to the lock at St. Andrews?

Mr. ROGERS: The water backs up the Assiniboine river for five or six miles.

Mr. OLIVER: It has been stated that bad sanitary results to the city of Winnipeg and vicinity have followed from the holding back of the water by the St. Andrew's lock. Have there been any bad results and, if so, has any action been taken to relieve the situation?

Mr. ROGERS: We have had no special evidence of very bad effects. The backing up of the water causes a good deal of the silt to fall in, and that necessitates a certain amount of dredging between Winnipeg and St. Andrew's lock. Apparently the river remaining at the high level is washing in the banks to some extent. I have not heard much about the sanitary conditions or any objection in connection with that side of the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Having reference to the sanitary conditions by reason of the curtain in the lock gates, if that be the correct expression, there is always a splendid opportunity for drainage; at all events in the spring the whole river flows right out.

Mr. ROGERS: But you inflict very serious damage if you open the locks and let the water rush out. It affects the bank of the river through the city of Winnipeg and people complain very bitterly about that condition. We have to exercise great care in opening the locks in that way so that the water will go down at a very gradual speed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Still the curtains are an essential feature in making a success of it?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: If the river only falls gradually it will not flush the undesirable element out very satisfactorily?

Mr. ROGERS: The river has to be flushed out at a very slow rate.

Mr. OLIVER: Well, if it is not really flushing, it is not doing very much. Everybody in the West is interested in the city of Winnipeg. I would like to say that there is liable to be serious consequences from emptying the sewage of Winnipeg into that water, made dead water, by the dam at the locks. Probably the only remedy would be to carry the sewage down past the locks so that it would drop into the water, if sewage has to be emptied into the river, below the part where the water is held still by the dam. There must be a very serious sanitary problem involved which ought to receive attention before the terrible results that might occur have occurred. At some time, if there is a terrible outbreak of disease in the city of Winnipeg, the people will be very much interested and it will take very stringent measures to remedy the condition. I think the time to apply the remedy is before the catastrophe occurs. When we know that there is a condition which in the nature of things must tend to very undesirable results.

Mr. ROGERS: We have had no complaints up to date.

Public Works, Saskatchewan and Alberta—Pigeon lake—improvements, $2,500.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the nature of the improvements at Pigeon lake and what is the purpose?

Mr. ROGERS: Pigeon creek traverses 15 miles of low lying land between Pigeon lake and the Battle river and it is proposed to straighten the creek at several bars and to clear the creek of dams and dead wood. The estimated cost is $2,500. A very large area of hay land bordering on the creek is subject to overflow. The purpose of straight-

ening the creek is to improve the flow and let the water drain out of the hay land. This is for the continuation of work done last year and the building of a dam in some clearing which has been of immense service to the district. We require this amount to complete the drainage of about 20 square miles thereby allowing a large number of settlers to procure hay for stock.

Mr. OLIVER: What the minister has said to indicate dealing with the stream that flows out of Pigeon lake, I would like to know if the action that is being taken in connection with the straightening of that stream is with the intention, or is likely to have the result, of lowering the level of Pigeon lake?

Mr. ROGERS: It is just the removal of certain obstructions. I could not give my hon. friend a very definite answer on that point, because I have not the information before me at the moment, but if my hon. friend is specially interested, I will be glad to have it looked up in the department and get the report of our engineer dealing fully with the matter.

Mr. OLIVER: I would be very much interested in getting the information as to what the Government has in view. Although Pigeon lake is not in the constituency which I represent, it is in the immediately adjoining constituency, and there are certain reasons why it is of particular interest to the people of Edmonton. While I have no criticism to offer of the attempt to straighten the creek, which is the outlet of Pigeon lake, I would like to say that I have very great objection to such action being taken as would tend to lower the level of the lake. I would think it would be very much more in the interest of the country at large if means were taken to hold the water of the lake at such a level as would conserve the spring freshets and would allow a more permanent flow of water down the creek than occurs now in a dry season. I would suggest that, if anything is being done with Pigeon lake, such works should be constructed as would constitute it a reservoir rather than that any action should be taken that would decrease the water in the lake.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: How large is Pigeon lake?

Mr. OLIVER: It is about 8 miles long by 6 wide.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Is there a stream running right through?

[Mr Rogers.]

Mr. OLIVER: It is the source of a stream which, with another similar stream, forms the Battle river. Pigeon lake is a very remarkable body of water; it occupies the crest of a height of land and is one of the sources of the Battle river. It is a lake that is very remarkably prolific in whitefish, contains very good water and has sometimes been looked to as a possible means of water supply for the city of Edmonton.

Mr. ROGERS: You have some navigation?

Mr. OLIVER: The lake itself would be navigable but it has no source of supply except springs. It occupies practically the height of land. The flow from the lake is practically nil at certain periods in some seasons and the little stream is practically dried up. I think it would be quite in order to make provision against that condition by holding the waters of the lake when there is a surplus and allowing them to pass out in such quantity only as to maintain a continuous supply of water in the stream.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Is the lake drying up at all?

Mr. OLIVER: Like all the lakes in the West it rises and falls, and we cannot tell exactly why it does so. It may not fall in a dry season; it may not rise very much in a wet season; it rises and falls by some rule of its own; but at any rate it does rise and fall, and while it may be for a succession of years the stream coming out of it will fall continually, at other times it will rise.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Is there as much water in it at any season of the year as there was four or five years ago?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, there is no permanent depletion.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Nearly all our lakes in Manitoba, except lake Winnipeg and similar lakes, are apparently drying up, although they were formerly good lakes.

Mr. OLIVER: That is not the case with this particular lake, but it is in a very remarkable position. While most of the lakes in Manitoba and the prairies generally occupy depressions and have other waters flowing into them, this lake is on the crest of the height of land.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: We also have a lake on the top of Turtle mountain, lake Max. During the last two or three years the water

in that lake has been getting less, although for twenty-eight years or so previous to that it contained each year about the same quantity of water.

Mr. ROGERS: In answer to what my hon. friend has said, I find the following words in the report made by Chief Engineer Elliott:

This work will be a great public service in holding the water rights of the lake.

Whatever he means by that, perhaps my hon. friend will understand.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know.

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be glad to send my hon. friend the chief engineer's full report on the matter.

Mr. OLIVER: Notwithstanding what the report may be, I hope the minister will keep in mind that my judgment is that the water of the lake should be conserved.

Mr. ROGERS: That is evidently what the chief engineer says this work will do.

Prince Albert protection works, $9,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the nature of these protection works?

Mr. ROGERS: This vote is required for the construction of 504 feet of bank protection work for the completion of the work on the wharf at Prince Albert. This work was asked for by the district engineer in order to protect the river bank from being carried away.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I suppose that is the same wharf that was undertaken while I was minister?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: In this connection I wish to draw the minister's attention to the fact that for a number of years there has been before the Government application for assistance or action looking to the protection of the river bank in front of the city of Edmonton. In many respects the two conditions are similar. The city of Edmonton is located along the river bank; and if the bank falls away the ground supporting the buildings also falls away and the streets and buildings in the city are destroyed. About 500 yards of the river bank, in front of a very thickly inhabited part of the city, where the main street runs close to the edge of the bank, has fallen away so much that some houses and a part of what at one time was the main street have sunk into the valley. The damage occurs from time to time. Very many representations have been made to the Government asking for assistance in protecting the bank, and several surveys have been made by the department. I think delegations have come here urging the Government to take means to protect the bank; and there has been a suggestion that if the Government would make the plans, the city would be willing to put up half the cost to show its good faith and willingness to help itself. The conditions are so different from what they are at Prince Albert, the bank of the river being 200 feet high at Edmonton, that it is absolutely beyond the financial ability of the city to protect the property interests on its own account. At the same time we feel that the Government has the same responsibility in regard to the protection of the bank at the front of the city of Edmonton as it has in regard to the front of the city of Prince Albert. If the minister has any information he can give in regard to the intentions of the Government towards Edmonton, I shall be very glad to have it.

Mr. ROGERS: I have some knowledge of the conditions at Edmonton which my hon. friend has described. In regard to the small item in the Estimates for Prince Albert, it is not altogether for the protection of the bank; it is for the protection of the wharf and probably of the bank to some extent at the same time. The two cases are probably not parallel; but I fancy the case in the city of Edmonton is parallel to some extent to the case we have in the city of Winnipeg in respect to the outflow of the water through the St. Andrew's lock, causing a great deal of damage to the banks as to which very serious complaint is made from time to time by the owners of lots on the river. This complaint has always been transmitted from the city council to the Government, and we are held blamable to that extent. In view of the fact that no new or special items of any account are in the Estimates for this year, nothing has been suggested in the way of providing protection for the banks either in Winnipeg or in Edmonton; but I believe when we are here next year, we shall have to get together and see if we cannot get Parliament to vote an amount for each place with a view of protecting the banks at both cities. The work in both Winnipeg and Edmonton is very necessary, and it probably belongs to this Parliament to render certain assistance. The city of Winnipeg, like the city of Edmonton, is very

willing to contribute its share; but it does not deem it its duty to pay the whole cost of protection of its banks. This matter will come up at a later date.

Mr. OLIVER: Several surveys of the bank at Edmonton have been made by officers of the Government. The problem is possibly complicated or difficult; and, while I would not wish to throw any aspersions on the abilities of any officers who have already made examinations, I think the Government would be acting wisely if it secured the best talent that could be got on this continent to make an expert examination of the ground with the information that the surveyors have already collected.

The gentlemen who have made the surveys are no doubt expert engineers, but I doubt if they have any expert knowledge of the peculiar conditions which have resulted in that sliding bank. If there are any parties who have expert knowledge of these conditions, I would urge upon the Government the desirability of getting their advice, based on an examination on the ground and with the advantage of the surveys that have actually been made, so that when Parliament meets again the Government would have that information before it on which to base any consideration it might see fit to give to the matter.

Mr. ROGERS: I will have that looked into.

Sturgeon river improvements, $9,500.

Mr. OLIVER: This is a matter in regard to which I have had some correspondence with the department. In that correspondence I said that while I had no doubt the Government had the best intentions in entering upon these improvements, they apparently have incurred the opposition of a number of the settlers who occupy lands along this river. I would urge upon the minister that however desirable it may be to constitute this large creek or small river into a measurably navigable stream, there are certain property rights of the people owning the land on both sides of the stream that are entitled to be regarded. Apparently, the officers of the Government, in dealing with the matter, have proceeded without any regard to these rights, having torn down fences and blown up bridges which were, as I understand it, actually on the property of these owners, and built at their expense and for their convenience. In the first place, I do not think the Government had the right to do this, and if it had the right, I do not think they should have done it, at any rate without due consideration, or without compensation to the people so injuriously affected. I do not know how far the minister is aware of these facts, but I have taken some trouble to bring them to the attention of the department by correspondence, and I take this opportunity of bringing them to the minister's own notice.

Mr. ROGERS: The matter is an important one, evidently. However, I must confess I do not remember having had it under my personal observation. But I shall be glad to make a personal matter of it and to look into the facts. If conditions are as my hon. friend suggests, they should be corrected, and will be corrected.

Mr. OLIVER: I cannot help but say, from the information I have received, that the officers of the Government have acted very reprehensibly in ignoring what was thoroughly understood to be the absolute property rights of the people who owned the land along the stream. I have no fault to find if the Government sees fit to spend the money to make this stream navigable for motor-boats,—that is the most that can be hoped for. The stream will make a pleasant connection between two lakes, and it runs through a nice tract of country. I have nothing but commendation for the Government for undertaking this work, but in carrying it out they have certainly run counter to the rights of the people occupying the land and have incurred a great deal of enmity. I am not saying that I am particularly sorry for that.

Mr. ROGERS: We shall have to correct that.

Mr. OLIVER: I should like to see it corrected.

Harbours and rivers, B.C.—Fraser river improvements, $300,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is this to improve the navigation between Westminster and the gulf of Georgia?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, to continue the jetty and to carry on dredging as well.

Fraser river (upper) and tributaries—improvements, $15,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is it proposed to do on the Upper Fraser?

Mr. ROGERS: To remove obstructions to navigation on the Upper Fraser, Nechaco, Stuart and Tachi rivers which drain a large area tributary to the Grand Trunk Pacific

railway. There are small towns, mining camps and farming settlements that will be afforded access to the railway by the improvement of navigation conditions.

Mr. OLIVER: When the track was being laid down the Upper Fraser valley, the question whether the two bridges to be built above and below the canyon were to have draws in them was raised. The bridges have been built without any such draws and of course they prevent steamboat navigation in that part of the river. What is the attitude of the Government in regard to that? Is it the intention to leave the bridges as they are, or has the Government any authority to compel the putting in of draws?

Mr. ROGERS: When such plans as the hon. gentleman refers to are approved, there is a condition attached that in the event of a request for navigation, the railway company is obliged on request to provide an opening suitable for the navigation of the locality.

Okanagan river—protecting and improving of navigable channel, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is this for?

Mr. ROGERS: This is for the maintenance of protection works constructed during the past several years, to continue bank protection and erect controlling weirs. The Okanagan river has been navigable for small power-boats, and this is meant to maintain a uniform water flow. The improvements were originally asked for by petition of the people of the Okanagan district.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the Okanagan river connect the upper and lower Okanagan lakes?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When I was minister an experiment was made in the way of connecting those two lakes; has that experiment been successful?

Mr. ROGERS: The report indicates that it has been successful.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This vote is to do some further work in connection with it?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is the North Thompson river navigable at Kamloops?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes; large, flat-bottomed river boats run up the river for a distance of about 80 miles.

Williams Head quarantine station—improvements and repairs, $3,000.

Mr. OLIVER: A gentleman in British Columbia has done me the honour of asking me to bring to the attention of the minister a matter relating to a wharf at Kootenay bay, in the riding represented by the hon. member for Kootenay. The information given me is that the district engineer, F. W. Aylmer, reported favourably, on March 14, 1912, on the construction of a wharf for which an appropriation of $7,500 had been made. His successor, J. P. Ford, re-surveyed the site, and the writer assumed that he also reported favourably. He says that although this engineer told him that he would recommend the same wharf as his predecessor had recommended, as a matter of fact he recommended a floating wharf, pile-protected, which would cost about $5,000. There actually has been constructed only a comparatively inexpensive floating wharf, which, the writer complains, is not adequate for the business, and is not in accordance with the understanding had with the Government. This gentleman has asked me to bring the matter to the attention of the Government and to urge that the original intention be carried out.

Mr. ROGERS: A wharf costing a large sum of money did not appear to be necessary; only one man was very specially interested in it, and it was thought that a floating wharf would be sufficient. In view of the fact that, on the recommendation of the engineer, we have carried out the construction of that floating wharf instead of a wharf costing $7,500. I am afraid that it would be impossible for us to make any change in our plans during the present year.

Dredging—new dredging plant, Maritime Provinces, $46,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister explain that item?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is required for the construction of new plant to carry on dredging in the Maritime Provinces. It includes: Dredge No. 2, St. Lawrence, new boiler, $9,000; No. 3, Restigouche, new boiler, $10,000; No. 9, Montague, new bucket one cubic yard larger, but lighter than old one, $900; Prince Edward, new independent swinging engine, 8 by 8, $800.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A few days ago I asked the Minister of Public Works to give me some information with regard to dredging plants purchased by the department in the

Maritime Provinces, and I mentioned particularly the plant at Fort Lawrence.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sorry that I have not the information here, but the chief engineer will see that it reaches the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. McKENZIE: What Government dredges were operating in Nova Scotia last summer?

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid that I cannot give that information now, but we can get it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Can the minister give me any information as to where the dredge Cape Breton was engaged last summer, and what she did? It was brought to my attention that she was rather poorly handled, and did not do very much work. There was lots of work to do, but she was late in getting to work and knocked off early. While she was supposed to be working she was not very successful. If the minister has any record of her operations it would be very interesting to a Cape Breton representative to know something about them.

Mr. ROGERS: I have taken a memorandum and I will see if we can get the information.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the minister intend building a new dredge? He has spoken only so far of repairs to existing dredges.

Mr. ROGERS: The items are all repairs.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is not a new dredging plant that is proposed?

Mr. ROGERS: Oh no.

Dredging—Maritime provinces, $600,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: In the last year some very useful and necessary dredging was being done at a place called Little Bras d'Or, opening up a channel which makes a proper entrance in to the Bras d'Or lakes. There is little more to be done, but it is very necessary that it should be finished this year in order to make what has been done available for use.

Mr. ROGERS: We will take a memorandum and will see that it is finished.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What dredging is proposed in the Maritime Provinces this season?

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Dufresne, who has the dredging under his control, has not yet completed his programme for the coming year and is at present out of the city, so I cannot give details.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Dredging—Ontario and Quebec, $600,000.

Mr. ROGERS: There is a material reduction here: it is $300,000 less than last year.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it intended to do that work or will the item merely stand in the Estimates?

Mr. ROGERS: The dredging is generally all done, the vote is usually exhausted.

Mr. MARCIL: The dredging I am interested in is in the Restigouche river. Some $30,000 has been spent at that mouth of that river around the property of the Bay de Chaleur Mill Company. I do not know whether the minister intends to continue that work. It is merely adding to the value of private property. I have heard former Ministers of Public Works advocate more dredging in Bonaventure and Gaspé; but they always told us that the dredges were very scarce but would come in the future. I have heard that promise for the last fourteen or fifteen years. Very little dredging has been done in that district. In the Baie de Chaleur they build breakwaters and wharves, but very few of them can be reached by a steamer. Some of them might be made very useful if dredging were done by the department. The chief engineer, who is very familiar with the district, could inform the minister where some very useful dredging could be done. At the Bonaventure river, which is the outlet for important timber limits, dredging was started in 1908 or 1909, but the dredge was taken away before the work was completed. A breakwater was built to keep open the mouth of the river at the entrance to the harbour, and the idea was to dredge out the entrance so that boats could go in and load at the wharf. The work was not completed. The dredge, which was owned by Mr. Lemoine, was removed to another place. Some useful dredging could also be done at Maria, where a wharf has been made and at New Richmond and Ruisseau Leblanc and other places on the coast. The minister would be well advised to have his officers report to him the work that might be done in that respect. Mr. Taché, district engineer for Bonaventure, is an experienced official who used to be on the north shore. He is familiar with all the conditions in the Baie de Chaleur. I am sorry to say that although the late Mr. Monk, when Minister of Public Works, asked Mr. Taché to report fully on all the works required there, and I understand

that Mr. Taché did so. The Department of Public Works carried out but very few of his recommendations. If economy has not been practised generally throughout the Dominion in public works it has been in Bonaventure. We have only two items this year, one for $1,500 at Paspebiac and one for $2,000 at New Carlisle on a coast line of 1,500 miles where people live largely by fishing and have a hard time to get along. Many works which have been commenced on the coast have remained uncompleted. I do not want to give the list because I might frighten the Minister of Public Works, but seeing that the constituency has this long shore line, with a wharf or breakwater about every ten miles. Only about four or five of these wharves are accessible to steamers. The others are practically only commenced. An extension would make these wharves much more useful to the fishermen, and to the people of the locality generally. As the minister knows, practically only the fringe of the Gaspé peninsula has been touched so far. The interior of the country has not been opened up to navigation at all. It is an immense pulp country, and a great country for agriculture, though the season is shorter than in the rest of the province of Quebec. The fisheries in the Baie des Chaleurs are about as good as any in Eastern Canada. Railway communication is very poor, but now the Minister of Railways has his law on the Statute Book, I hope he will remedy this state of affairs. I know the Minister of Public Works is a progressive man, and I hope he will do something for the Gaspé peninsula too. I do not expect to get anything to-night, but I am just doing a little proselytizing. I want to call his attention to the fact that at Chandler, in the township of Pabos, in the county of Gaspé, quite close to Bonaventure, a large pulp industry has been established. Unfortunately it is the case that it sometimes takes Americans to realize the value of some of the resources of this country. A syndicate from Philadelphia has opened up this pulp business with a capitalization of between two and three million dollars, and in the spot which was a wilderness five or six years ago there is now a thriving town, with all
10 p.m. that is necessary to give employment to the people. This syndicate is going to utilize the Gaspé railway, and the deep water wharf that the department has constructed at Gaspé basin, and they intend to carry on a large business. I want to point out to the minister that if the department extended proper facilities, industries of this kind of work could be started all along the coast. We not only want wharves extended, but some dredging done, so that the boats can get in and out all along the coast. I hope the minister will pardon me for having gone into this matter at such length, and I hope that at the next session of Parliament he will remember Gaspé peninsula, which has been overlooked this year.

Mr. ROGERS: I am quite sure that my hon. friend will appreciate the fact that it is very difficult for me to be familiar with the local conditions which he has so well described to us. I will promise him that I will present his statement to Mr. Dufresne, who has not yet completed his dredging plans for the coming year, and who I am sure will carefully consider what the hon. member has said.

Mr. TOBIN: I notice by the Auditor General's Report of last year that several thousands of dollars were spent in the county of Rimouski, in dredging a small brook at St. Mathieu. I should like to ask the minister on whose recommendation the work was done and for whose benefit it was?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the information here, but I can get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I can give my hon. friend the information. The Auditor General's Report shows that $4,869.15 was spent in making a navigable channel from lake St. Simon to St. Fabien. Here are some of the items taken from the Auditor General's Report: Foremen at $2.50 a day; carters, 30 days at $1.25; labourers, 1,931 days at $1.75; J. Audette, St. Mathieu, 24 pair rubber boots at $5.80 a pair; sundries, $2.28; C. Gagnon, 6 pair rubber boots at $9 a pair; A. Belzile, St. Mathieu, 8,485 feet boards at $13; cartage, $13; sundries, $35.97; D. Theberge, St. Michieu, 18 shovels at $1.255 each, and 49 at $1.10 each.

Mr. BUREAU: That was for hand dredging.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The shovels are less expensive than those the Minister of Militia got. They have no holes in them. You would suppose, Mr. Chairman, that a new highway of transportation was being opened up from lake St. Simon to St. Fabien. You can almost see large merchant ships plying between St. Mathieu and St. Fabien. I think it will be suffiicent for me to quote the report of the Minister of Public Works for the year 1913-14, page 218:

St. Mathieu—Dredging.

Saint Mathieu, in the county of Rimouski, is situated four miles south of the station of St. Simon, and is an important parish with a population of about 1,500. Farming and lumbering are the principal industries of the locality. There are two saw-mills, one of the best butter factories of the district and one butter box factory.

There are, at St. Mathieu, two lakes separated by a strip of marshy land; the upper or west lake is about 4 miles long, and the lower lake 1½ mile. The discharge of the two lakes is what is called River St. Simon, and passes by St. Fabien, near the station of the Intercolonial railway. By dredging between the two lakes and a portion of the river, it will permit of navigation to a depth of 3 feet sufficient for the driving of logs and timber.

Mr. ROGERS: Very useful work.

Mr. LAPOINTE (reading):

During the fiscal year 1913-14, the strip of land between the two lakes was dredged for a length of 400 feet by a width of 30 feet, and an average depth of 4 feet, containing an area of 13,200 feet or 1,955 yards. The entrance of the river was also dredged for a length of 900 feet by a width of 35 feet, and and average depth of 4 feet, containing an area of 31,500 feet, or 4,666 cubic yards.

Amount expended, $4,804.89.

Mr. BUREAU: Who owns the lake?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin). The Minister of Public Works has just stated that this log driving was a very useful work. Well, this is the first time I have heard of the Federal Government giving money to help the lumber operators in driving their logs. I know that under the provincial law, lumber operators have certain rights of expropriation, but they have to pay for those rights. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe is the owner of this lake. The timber limits in the vicinity are owned by the Trois Pistoles Pulp and Lumber Co., of which the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe is president; and I think he can bear me witness that no lumbering is done there now. I think this was only a scheme to get money out of the treasury of Canada.

When we see in the Auditor General's Report the words "making a navigable channel from lake St. Simon to St. Fabien," we must conclude that it is a very fine title for a very small thing. I really think that this work should not have been done and that the money of the country should not have been spent there. I know that river and lake very well. I have been there on a couple of fishing trips and there is very good trout fishing. A friend of mine at Rivière du Loup said it would be very easy to go and fish in lake St. Mathieu. "Why?" I asked. "Because," he replied, "we can go there by motor boat from the station at St. Fabien; we have dredged the river to such an extent as to permit motoring." I do not think the department spent that money for the purpose of giving sportsmen a chance to go fishing in lake St. Mathieu but I do think there is no other purpose served.

Mr. ROGERS: I am always generous to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and especially so to my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin).

Mr. TOBIN: The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) said that the lake belonged to myself. I will say that it is a private lake. I have owned it for years although the lumber further up belongs to the Trois Pistoles Pulp and Lumber Company, of which I am president. We have never asked for any work to be done in that part of the country and certainly no dredging. It was a surprise to me and my company when we were informed that there were people at work dredging that small brook. It is only a small brook that you could jump across at places,—eight or ten feet wide. No lumber is floated down it. Probably, as my hon. friend from Kamouraska said, this improvement will be very useful for fishing purposes but in the public interest it was not called for and I think the money of the country could have been spent on more profitable work than dredging this small brook which will enable you to sail down from lake St. Mathieu to St. Fabien.

An hon. MEMBER: Did they need rubber boots for it?

Mr. TOBIN: How much water is there in this brook when they required rubber boots to do the work. For shovels that cost about $8 a dozen they charged $15 a dozen. These items do not amount to very much money but the purchase of rubber boots for working in a small stream like this is simply putting the country to unnecessary expense. I do not know who asked for the work. I would like to find out from the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. ROGERS: I will look it up.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will the minister let us know who got the rubber boots?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF: Is it customary for the department to buy boots for men who are

doing work for the department and who are receiving the ordinary wages? Do they buy clothing as well?

Mr. ROGERS: That has been a common practice for many long years.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand from the minister that Mr. Dufresne, who has charge of the dredging in his department, has not yet finished his programme?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. BUREAU: I would ask him to take into consideration the necessity of dredging the St. Lawrence opposite Three Rivers. The Grand Trunk comes in on the south side of the St. Lawrence opposite Three Rivers and the only communication between the Grand Trunk wharf at Three Rivers and that at Doucet's Landing, is by way of ferry. Last year the city of Three Rivers went to a good deal of expense in getting a modern steel steamer to perform the service between these two points. Two or three times during the summer the service was interrupted on account of boulders and shallow water. I would ask the minister to have an inquiry made and see if it would not be possible to dredge this channel. It is a great inconvenience to have the boat put out of commission. The propellor is often broken by these boulders and we are without communication with the Grand Trunk sometimes three, four and five days. There is no dock where we can repair the boat except at Sorel. It takes one day each to go to Sorel, dock the boat and bring it back. It would be a very small item. Five or six days' dredging with a Government dredge would be sufficient to enable the traffic to go on uninterruptedly during the summer months and even during the winter. It is very seldom that the river freezes opposite Three Rivers during the winter but sometimes the water gets low in the winter, as it does in summer, and it would be a very material help if we could have this work done.

Mr. ROGERS: I will see that my hon. friend's statement is brought to the attention of Mr. Dufresne to-morrow.

Dredging—Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, $95,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Is any of this dredging to take place in Alberta, and, if so, where?

Mr. ROGERS: This is like the other dredging; we have not Mr. Dufresne's programme for the work ready yet. This is just for the maintenance of our own departmental dredges that we have in existence there. We have them at Anderson's Creek, Mackey river, Labelle, Oak point, Gimli, Poplar Park, Fort Qu'Appelle, Last Mountain, Cumberland lake and Grouard.

Mr. OLIVER: What is proposed to be done at Grouard?

Mr. ROGERS: We have nothing proposed for the present year, but we have a dredge there apparently.

Mr. McCRANEY: When the minister gives more information I wish he would let me know the programme of dredging in the province of Saskatchewan as well. I spoke to the minister before dinner and asked for some information in regard to the price paid for the Saskatoon post office site and the amount paid and when the minister gives his answer I hope he will give it so that it will go into Hansard.

Mr. ROGERS: I have a note of my hon. friend's question.

Mr. OLIVER: In some years past there have been river improvements on the Athabasca at Grand Rapids. There does not appear to be anything in this section of the Estimates regarding the Athabasca river. Is there any provision anywhere for the continuation of those improvements?

Mr. ROGERS: We have no provision made up at the present time as the programme has not been completed for the dredging work but if there is necessity for any work in that locality it can be provided for out of this vote. I will bring the remarks of the hon. gentleman to the attention of Mr. Dufresne.

Mr. OLIVER: The work at Grand Rapids on the Athabasca has claimed the attention of the Government for several seasons. It is a very difficult piece of work and perhaps some mistakes may have been made in the method in which the work has been done; but it is of very great importance to carrying on the trade of the north country until the Waterways railway is completed. Therefore, I would urge upon the minister that with the opening of spring it would be right and proper that an examination should be made of the condition of the rapids and the result of the previous work, and that if there is anything that can be done to better the conditions for the business of the coming season, it should be done. There is a period of low water after the ice goes out; that is, as soon as spring opens, there is low water for a short time when work can be done to better advantage

than it can be done at any time until the late fall of when winter sets in. My impression is that while some betterment has been created by the work done, some difficulties have also been created that it may be well to have removed.

Mr. ROGERS: We will have the matter looked into.

Mr. OLIVER: Grouard is a town situated on Buffalo bay, partly an arm and partly a separate lake from Lesser Slave lake. The original intention was to have the shallows, which to a certain extent separate Buffalo bay from the lake, dredged so that lake steamers could pass freely up to Grouard settlement. Now that the railroad has gone into that country and there is a railroad station at Sucker creek on the south side of the lake about ten or twelve miles from Grouard, it is just as necessary as it ever was, if the people of Grouard are to have the best advantage from the nearness of the railroad, that there should be free navigation from the railroad station at Sucker creek to Grouard town on Buffalo bay, and that the shallows intervening between the bay and the lake should be dredged so that the lake steamers could pass freely. I would like to bring that very strongly to the attention of the minister.

Mr. ROGERS: I will take the matter up with the department.

Roads and bridges—Banff—new bridge, $20,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Where is this bridge to be situated?

Mr. ROGERS: On the old site.

Mr. OLIVER: Has anything been done yet?

Mr. ROGERS: The plans are not finished yet.

Mr. OLIVER: The old bridge is becoming somewhat insecure.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, we will have to get at this work very soon.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to inform the minister that the bridge is pretty old and is becoming insecure and it should be repaired.

Dominion bridges generally, including approaches, $5,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are they all old bridges?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. MARCIL: Is the approach of the Dominion bridge at Matapedia completed?

Mr. ROGERS: The engineer informs me that it is completed.

Interprovincial bridge across Ottawa river at Hawkesbury, the Ontario and Quebec governments each to contribute $15,000, $80,000.

Mr. PROULX: Last summer the department called for tenders, and I thought the contract had been awarded because a certain contractor from Montreal brought some machinery to Grenville, which is opposite Hawkesbury; but I was informed the other day by the minister in answer to a question that I put on the Order Paper that no contract had been awarded. Has the lowest tenderer been notified that his tender has been acccpted?

Mr. ROGERS: No tender has been accepted as yet.

Mr. PROULX: How is it that the contractor came to Grenville with machinery expecting to start on the work? In fact, he urged upon the town council of Hawkesbury and the town council of Grenville to press the matter upon the Government and they cabled Sir George Perley, who represents Argenteuil, to urge upon the Government to award the contract.

Mr. ROGERS: Sir George Perley has been cabling urging us to start the work. We will get at it this spring.

Mr. PROULX: Has a certain gentleman in Montreal been notified that his tender has been accepted?

Mr. ROGERS: No person has been notified yet.

Mr. PROULX: Then I cannot understand how this contractor brought some tools and machinery to Grenville and expected to start on the work. I thought he had been notified that his tender had been accepted, but that the contract had not been signed.

Mr. ROGERS: The contract is not signed yet.

Mr. PROULX: As to the right of way, before the election of 1911, a certain right of way through the mill property of the Hawkesbury Lumber Company had been expropriated. After the change of Government, the right of way was changed, and I understand that the other right of way, which the company now wish the Government to take, will be just as convenient for the public, but I would like to know

whether this new right of way has been deeded over to the Government or expropriated?

Mr. ROGERS: A new set of plans has recently been made for a new right of way. I do not know whether it covers a portion of what my hon. friend has in mind or not.

Mr. PROULX: I know that the engineers of the department either last summer or the summer before surveyed a new right of way. Has it been acquired by the Government or expropriated?

Mr. ROGERS: We will look up the information for my hon. friend. I am not clear on the point.

Mr. PROULX: I would like to know also what compensation the company is asking for the other right of way. In 1911, the Government offered $5,000.

Mr. ROGERS: Was that not considered enough?

Mr. PROULX: The company was not objecting so much to the amount, but it had objected to the location of the right of way, and the matter has not yet been decided by the Exchequer Court. After September, 1911, I understand, the company prevailed upon the Government to change the right of way. I put a question on the Order Paper to ascertain what compensation was paid by the Government, and the answer was that no compensation was paid, that the right of way had been expropriated. I do not understand how it could have been expropriated without compensation.

Mr. ROGERS: Probably it has not been settled by the Exchequer Court up to date.

Mr. PROULX: I suppose the department would say that the survey had been registered, and the Exchequer Court had not yet settled the amount. What amount does the department offer the company?

Mr. ROGERS: Somewhere about $5,000.

Mr. PROULX: Do they refuse to accept that?

Mr. ROGERS: Evidently, or we should not have gone to the court.

Mr. PROULX: I hope my hon. friend will get the information.

Mr. MARCIL: I desire to call the attention of the minister to the request repeatedly made by the people of Campbellton and Bonaventure opposite for a bridge across the Restigouche river. Seven or eight years ago a Bill was passed to erect a joint highway and railway bridge at this point to connect the Gaspé system of railways and the Intercolonial. Fifty thousand dollars was voted as a subsidy. But this was deemed insufficient, and it was not found possible to float the securities necessary for the work. Meantime, the change of Administration took place. Since that time, the people on both sides, apparently assuming that the prospect of the joint highway and railway bridge was rather remote, organized a crusade in favour of a purely highway bridge. Deputations have come to Ottawa, and I understand that the Campbellton Board of Trade and all the municipal councils concerned have joined in this request. I understand that the last move made by the minister or the department, in answer to the deputation, was to instruct Mr. Stead, the department engineer for New Brunswick, to report upon this project of a highway bridge. Has any progress been made in ascertaining the cost? Has the department abandoned the policy of a joint railway and highway bridge and decided to limit itself to the highway bridge? The time will come when a railway bridge will be needed at this point to connect the Intercolonial with the Transcontinental and other railways.

Mr. ROGERS: We had a deputation here about a month ago of the different councils interested in this work. They pressed for a highway bridge. The information we have goes to show that this is a very, very expensive undertaking, much more expensive than was at first anticipated. After going into the facts with the deputation, it was decided that we should have a re-survey by Mr. Stead, who is supposed to be a first-class engineer, and Mr. Stead has undertaken that service. We shall not have his report for some considerable time. We thought it would be a good time to make a more extensive survey, in order to get at the facts in a detailed manner and to judge what is best in the public interest.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the department come to a conclusion as to building merely a highway bridge? Has the project to build a combined railway and highway bridge been abandoned?

Mr. ROGERS: We have not come to any decision, and cannot arrive at a decision until we get the report of Mr. Stead showing the difference in the estimated cost of the two.

Mr. MARCIL: If a combined railway and highway bridge were built, it is calculated that Gaspé Basin, with a railway connection, would be brought into close communication with New England cities, especially with Boston, the great fish market for the United States. Gaspé and the whole Baie des Chaleurs district would be within twenty-four hours of Boston.

Mr. PROULX: How many tenders were there for the substructure of the bridge at Hawkesbury?

Mr. ROGERS: Six.

Mr. PROULX: What was the lowest?

Mr. ROGERS: I will give the hon. gentleman the list: R. E. Sutherland, Lindsay, $70,000; Galbraith, $78,000; Kennedy Construction Company, Montreal, $78,000; Jones Company, Limited, Ottawa, $90,000; Doney & McDonald, Alexandria, $90,000; Thomas & Wood, $90,000.

Mr. PROULX: The tender of Mr. Galbraith is $78,000, and there is one for $70,000. Which one is that?

Mr. ROGERS: Sutherland.

Mr. PROULX: Is he the one who will get this contract?

Mr. ROGERS: If he is capable of doing the work, certainly.

Mr. PROULX: Have the tenderers been notified that their tender is accepted?

Mr. ROGERS: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. PROULX: Is it the intention to go on with the work?

Mr. ROGERS: We have been urged very strongly to go on with it. Sir George Perley has been cabling about it, and we have promised to do it if possible.

Mr. PROULX: I hope the minister will carry out this work, for it has been under way for quite a few years and is very much needed.

Matapedia road—repairs and improvements, $2,500.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister give some explanation of this item?

Mr. ROGERS: This is to repair and improve seven miles of this highway. This road was built as a military road and has always been considered as Federal property, and the Government has authorized repairs several times. It is in good condition, and is under the control of the municipalities, except for nineteen miles, where there is no municipality.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand this work was done in the unorganized territory along the Intercolonial. This was the road along the line of railway. I would call the minister's attention to the fact that between Millstream and Matapedia in the municipalities of St. André de Restigouche and St. Laurent de Matapedia, ninety-five per cent of the population live on the high land, while down along the line of railway there are very few residents, indeed. They have to pass through there to reach Matapedia and Campbellton, where they do most of their business. The work is not yet completed, and I think the minister might as well see that the work is completed right through, especially through that portion beyond Millstream which is known as St. André de Restigouche. It would be unfortunate if the usefulness of the road, which is now being put into first-class condition, should be destroyed by the last two or three miles being left in an impassable condition.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I am in perfect harmony with the few remarks made by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), regarding the road in Matapedia. I myself last year called the attention of the Government engineer to the necessity of having the road between Millstream and Matapedia repaired at the Government's expense, because those who are charged with the maintenance of that part of the road are settlers who reside at a long distance from it and who are of rather limited means.

The Bellechasse Telephone Company, in constructing its line, has erected its poles in the middle of the road, and notwithstanding the repeated request of the Government engineer, has left them there. That road is now fit for carriages and I urge upon the department that the necessary steps be taken as soon as possible to have these poles removed as they constitute a public nuisance.

Miniota—bridge to Indian reserve, $8,000.

Mr. OLIVER: How does it happen that the Government is building this bridge?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is required for the construction of a steel bridge across the Assiniboine river at Miniota, at an estimated cost of $25,000. A request for its construction was made on behalf of the Miniota municipality by letter dated

March 17. I am informed that the settlers are very anxious that the bridge shall be ready so that the spring crop may be carried over it. I do not know why we should be building a bridge there; this is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. OLIVER: If this were established as a precedent, there would be a rather heavy demand upon the department for bridges throughout the West.

Mr. ROGERS: The only reason for the Government's share in its construction is probably its connection with the Indian reserve. The Dominion Government is asked to pay $8,000 of the cost, the balance to be paid by the Provincial Government and the two municipalities concerned.

Mr. OLIVER: I know several places in the Edmonton district where bridges are needed.

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid it is a bad precedent.

Athabaska Landing to lake la Biche telegraph line, $1,000.

Mr. OLIVER: To what point on lake la Biche does this line run?

Mr. ROGERS: My information is that the line to be followed is from Plamondonville to the Roman Catholic mission, a distance of ten miles. It was originally asked for by petition of the residents of lake la Biche and Plamondonville.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the line completed to the mission?

Mr. ROGERS: It is completed to Plamondonville.

Mr. OLIVER: I would say that this line should run to the Hudson bay establishment, which is some little distance beyond the Roman Catholic mission. The Hudson bay establishment is the point on the lake to which the railway has been constructed, and has been and naturally will continue to be the business centre of that district. I would urge upon the minister that this line be carried to the Hudson bay establishment, so that it will connect with the railway line.

Battleford—Isle la Crosse line to complete, $7,000.

Mr. OLIVER: How far is that line completed now?

Mr. ROGERS: My information is that it has been completed to a point forty miles north of Green lake. The work had to be stopped for the season owing to the non-delivery of poles by the contractors, who promised to deliver the balance during the winter, too late to enable the work to be completed during the last fiscal year.

Mr. OLIVER It will be completed to Isle la Cross this year, will it?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Construction of telegraph line from Athabaska Landing to Fort McMurray—to complete, $15,000.

Mr. OLIVER: In what position is that line? I think when the late Government went out there was a sum in the Estimates to complete this line to Fort McMurray.

Mr. ROGERS: I understand the line is completed and this vote is to provide stables, offices, etc.

Mr. OLIVER: I would again impress on the minister the desirability of having a loop line connection from House river, where this line leaves the Athabaska to follow the portage over to Fort McMurray, about 8 or 10 miles down to the head of the Grand Rapids, where the great difficulty in navigation on the Athabaska occurs. There will be an operator at House river and a telephone from there to Grand Rapids would be of very great use to navigation on the river. With the reasonably efficient management the minister now has in connection with the construction of that line it should be possible to do that this summer.

Mr. ROGERS: We will take it up and see.

Peace river telegraph line—offices and dwellings to Saskatoon lake and Grande Prairie, $5,000.

Mr. OLIVER: The other night the minister promised to give me information about the rental of certain buildings at Grande Prairie.

Mr. ROGERS: We rent just the one building, the immigration building, at $65 a month from Mr. A. Patterson.

Mr. OLIVER: What accommodation has the telegraph office now?

Mr. ROGERS: The deputy has no information about that here, but he thinks we have our own office.

Mr. OLIVER: Will these buildings be erected during the coming summer?

Mr. ROGERS: We expect to establish them this summer.

Peace river telegraph line—erection of office at Dunvegan, $3,500.

Mr. OLIVER: Is that to go on this summer?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, we have promised that for this summer.

Peace river Grande Prairie telegraph line—extension from lake Saskatoon to Hudson's Hope, B.C., $12,000.

Mr. OLIVER: How far has that line been completed?

Mr. ROGERS: This is required to complete the construction from lake Saskatoon to Hudson's Hope and a telephone line from Port St. John to Hudson's Hope, an approximate distance of 50 miles at an estimated cost of $12,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the line completed to Fort St. John?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: And it will be completed to Hudson's Hope this summer?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, we are to go on with that.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the work being done by contract?

Mr. ROGERS: The poles are being got out by contract, but the stringing of the wires is being done by our own men.

Mr. OLIVER: I am given information that there has been some mismanagement of affairs there which resulted in a number of teams going from Grande Prairie to Grouard for wire and coming back empty. If that were done by a contractor it would not make any difference, but if it were done under the Government I think that the department ought to be aware that that is the way their business is being managed, as there will certainly be a serious and unnecessary addition to the cost of construction if very much of that sort of thing is being done. The trip would be about 125 miles.

Telegraph and telephone lines generally, $7,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Under this item I would ask for some information about the telephone system in Nova Scotia, particularly in the island of Cape Breton. In 1911 provision was made for the building of a line—indeed, I think it was pretty well under way—between Baddeck and the northeast of Margaree and also from Baddeck to Little Narrows and from Little Narrows to McKay Point. I think the line has been completed from Baddeck to northeast of Margaree and from Baddeck to the Little Narrows. What has been done towards completing the line from Little Narrows to McKay's Point? There is a section of country there which is rather isolated from the rest of the country by an arm of the sea, and it is exceedingly difficult in some seasons of the year to communicate with the towns without a telephone or telegraph line. The intention was to give the people along that section of the country the benefit of a telephone line. The poles were got out, I think in 1911 or before, and I understand that the wire has been put on the ground. Has anything been done towards the erection of a line from Little Narrows to McKay's Point which is right opposite the shire town of Baddeck on the other side of that arm of Bras d'Or lake?

Mr. ROGERS: We do not appear to have any information about that with us to-night. I have asked the deputy to write to my hon. friend to-morrow and give him the particulars of the conditions.

Mr. McKENZIE: The county of Victoria which I represent has not the benefit of competing telegraph lines like other counties in Cape Breton and all the counties in Nova Scotia. Most of them have the services of the Government line, the Western Union and the Canadian Pacific railway, all competing lines, giving a good service. But in Victoria we have only the one lone, solitary Government line and we have an extension of something over 100 miles from the shire town across to the extreme north end of the county with no means of communication except the Government telegraph line. Of course, we have the mails, but we have no telephone and no other telegraph system.

It is at the northern end of the county that the cable connects with the Magdalen Islands. Considerable business goes over that line. The minister will understand that, as we are dependent for rapid communication upon this one line, it is exceedingly important to the people of the county that the service should be well conducted. But I regret to say that it is not managed with that business style and acumen that I think should be shown in connection with so important a service. I am sorry that in this connection I have to bring to the notice of the minister something that is political in its character. I brought it to the attention of the minister last year, but I do not think anything has

been done about it. I am not bringing this matter up for the purpose of asking the minister to dismiss any of his officials. For one thing I would not expect him to appoint in the place of a dismissed official any friend of mine. But what I ask the minister to do is to discipline his officials so that there will be a proper management of the Government business. Without mentioning names, I submit to the minister that a message sent from Baddeck over this line to any part of the county is not regarded as private. The facilities furnished in connection with the office at Baddeck are of such a character that the service is not private. Perhaps the man in charge of the office does not get enough pay to keep it private, or to conduct it as business of this character should be conducted. I have already brought to the notice of the minister that, during a local election that was conducted in the county a year ago last February, this whole system—the only system in the county—was absolutely commandeered by the managers of that campaign; they took it entirely under their own control, and for the month or so that the campaign was in progress they used the line for their own purposes without paying one cent to the Government for the service. I am rather sorry to find that as far as I can learn nothing has been done or said about this matter since I last brought it to the notice of the minister. We had a trial in the town of Baddeck in connection with that election, and the man whom the minister has in charge of that work went on the stand, and of his own volition told under oath how he took the responsibility of taking over that line as a piece of electioneering machinery while the campaign was on, and he swore that he did not charge any one of his friends one cent, and that he made no return to the Government. That evidence was given on oath before the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. That is the condition of affairs in connection with the only telegraph service we have in the county; and I appeal to the minister whether that is satisfactory and as it ought to be. As a sound, progressive business people we have a right to expect better things. We have a right to expect that not only the office at Baddeck but every office on the line shall be well conducted, and that the minister shall give strict orders that such a thing as commandeering such an important piece of public property for the use of any party—I care not which—shall not be tolerated for one moment. I trust it will never occur again.

11 p.m.

Mr. ROGERS: I remember that the hon. member brought this matter up last year. I do not think he has had any reason to complain of irregularities during the last year. I can assure my hon. friend that I gave strict instructions that such a state of affairs would not be tolerated. The telegraph service should be kept absolutely private for every citizen of the country, and I shall endeavour to see that it is kept private.

Public Works—Engineering Branch—salaries of engineers, inspectors, superintendents, draughtsmen, clerks and messengers of outside service, $435,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: About how many people does this include?

Mr. ROGERS: Over 200 people, the whole engineering staff of the Public Works Department.

Mr. GRAHAM: Both inside and outside service?

Mr. ROGERS: Not the inside service at Ottawa, but apart from that it includes both inside and outside.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is this increase accounted for by additions to the staff or by salary increases?

Mr. ROGERS: Additions to the staff.

Miscellaneous—monument of His Late Majesty King Edward VII, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is that monument completed?

Mr. ROGERS: It is in the hands of the sculptor. It is to be erected in Ottawa.

Mr. MARCIL: Did the Dominion Government subscribe anything to the Montreal monument?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think so.

Miscellaneous—construction and operation of water storage dams on the Ottawa river and tributaries, surveys in connection therewith and settlement of land damages, $200,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would the minister tell us briefly what is being done? Are the land damages very heavy? I believe that the Provincial Government had to pay more in land damages than the cost of the dams.

Mr. ROGERS: This amount of $200,000 is required to provide for the construction and operation of dams and sluiceways at points on the Ottawa river and its tributaries. The object is to store the spring

floods and augment the low water flow, thus equalizing the run-off of the Ottawa valley throughout the year. This also necessitates the purchase of lands damaged by maintaining reservoir surfaces at high stage during summer and autumn.

The appropriation now applied for is apportioned as follows:

Timiskaming Dam.		
Stone riprap to protect river bottom from scouring	$40,000	
Sluice opening machine	30,000	
Dam tenders and extra labour operating	3,000	
Damage claims inundated lands.	25,000	
Quinze Dam.		
Sluice opening machine	30,000	
Dam tenders and extra labour operating	3,000	
Booms and cribwork passing timber	5,000	
Kipawa Dam.		
Repairs, booms and cribwork	2,000	
Dam tenders and extra labour operating	3,000	
Salaries, supplies and travelling.	10,000	
		$151,000
Ottawa Storage Dams—General Surveys.		
Salaries of office staff	$25,000	
Travel and supplies	5,000	
Survey, metering, labour and supplies	20,000	
		50,000
		$201,000
Say		$200,000

Mr. GRAHAM: This is to be expended this year?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. G. V. WHITE: Does this include repairs to the dam that was carried away some time ago?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand the dam was built for the purpose of regulating the flow of the Ottawa river. Is it the intention of the department to do anything towards the construction of a dam at lake La Loutre having the same object; that is to regulate the flow of the St. Maurice river, which is a navigable river and is under the control of the Federal Parliament?

Mr. ROGERS: No, we have had no request to contribute to it that I know of.

International Commission, river St. John, N.B., $12,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are they still busy?

Mr. ROGERS: Apparently.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know who they are. They may be still drawing their pay and not be busy.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. McKENZIE: Who compose this commission? It has been recently reconstructed, I presume, since the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) was appointed.

Mr. ROGERS: That is the International Commission; it has nothing to do with this.

The National Gallery of Canada, including the purchase of paintings by the board of trustees, $25,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Last year we had an item of $100,000. Could the minister tell us what purchases of works of art have been made out of that $100,000 and what it is proposed to purchase with this $25,000?

Mr. ROGERS: A large number of important and valuable works of art, both Canadian and foreign, have been purchased. The expenditure upon foreign pictures, which totals $79,579, includes the acquisition of such well-known and interesting works of art as the following:

Oil Paintings.	
Francecco Goya, A Governor of Cadiz	$15,000
J. F. Millet, Oedipus taken from the tree	20,000
Claude Monet, Waterloo Bridge	6,000
Bart. de Bruyn, Christian von Conersheim and his wife, 16th Century	8,500
French Primitive, Christ carrying the Cross, 15th Century	1,000
Frans Floris, The Five Senses	2,700
Spanish School, The Slave, 17th Century	1,500
J. B. C. Corot, Street at Anvers	3,500
Frantin-Latour, Bouquet de Roses	3,250
W. McTaggart, Through the Corn	2,500
A. Monticelli, Don Quixote	2,000
Allan Ramsay, Countess of Guilford	3,250
Etchings, drawings, lithographs, etc.	3,879
Bronzes: Antoine Barye, 9 bronzes of animal studies	7,500

Mr. MARCIL: Are these Canadian paintings?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): Will the minister tell me the names of the members of this commission?

Mr. ROGERS: Sir Edmund Walker, Senator Boyer and Dr. Sheppard of Montreal.

Monument to the memory of the late Hon. Thomas D'Arcy McGee, $8,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the contract been awarded for this monument?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: How is the work progressing?

Mr. ROGERS: It is completed, but it has not been put in place yet.

Mr. MARCIL:: Has a site been chosen on Parliament Hill?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Who has the contract?

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Alward, of Toronto.

Georgian Bay Ship Canal, Royal Commission, $25,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Quite an amount has been expended on this Royal Commission—apparently $15,000. Have they given us any report of what they have done? We ought to have something before the House for $15,000. Have they given the minister a verbal report as to what they are doing and where they are sitting?

Mr. ROGERS: They are sitting in the Bryson building on Queen street, Ottawa. I would invite hon. gentlemen, if they have the time to spare, to go down and inspect the work they are doing. I do not think there is any more creditable work being carried on in any branch of any department of the Government than that which they are carrying on in obtaining the information in connection with the proposed canal. It would interest any hon. member of the House, if he has a moment to spare, to go in there, meet Mr. Evans and see the plans they are preparing, and the information they are collecting. It will be very valuable to the House and the country.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Who compose the commission?

Mr. ROGERS: Sandford Evans.

Mr. G. V. WHITE: Has the minister any idea when the report will be completed?

Mr. ROGERS: As soon as they get the information that they are collecting now they will hold public hearings in different parts.

Mr. McKENZIE: I suppose it can be indefinitely extended to suit the convenience of the Government?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know that there is any convenience to the Government. We are anxious to go ahead with it.

Mr. GRAHAM: How long does the minister imagine it will take?

Mr. ROGERS: I think—at least this year.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a matter that should not be dragged out any longer than necessary in order that the country may be seized with the information. It would have been a good idea if Parliament had been given an interim report to show what they have been doing. I do not mean that they should give away any information that they are not ready to give to the public, but we would like to know what methods they are adopting to get the information. It would be of great interest to many people who are watching for some report from this commission. I quite understand that if they do their work well they could not rush it, but it would have been a good idea if the Government had given us an interim report showing what progres had been made.

Mr. ROGERS: That might have been done, but I hope my hon. friend will take the trouble to go down and see the commission some day.

To pay Western Drydock and Shipbuilding Co., Limited, of Port Arthur, a portion of the second payment of subsidy due them upon their completion of the work covered by the agreement ratified by chapter 57, 3-4 George V, 1913, notwithstanding the work is not completed, $35,641.50.

Mr. ROGERS: This is under the Act.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are you going to make them a progress estimate, a payment on account.

Mr. ROGERS: This is the second payment.

Mr. McKENZIE: What size of vessels will this dry dock at Port Arthur accommodate?

Mr. ROGERS: It is 400 and some odd feet in length.

Mr. GRAHAM: What class of dry dock is it?

Mr. ROGERS: Third class. It will accommodate boats for the lake trade, and is doing very satisfactory work.

Public Works—for operation and maintenance of inspection boats, $60,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many inspection boats have you in the service, and where are they?

Mr. ROGERS: 21 steamboats and gasoline launches. I will send over the list to my hon. friend, if he cares to see where the inspection boats are.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the nature of their work?

Mr. ROGERS: They inspect the public works, such as dredging and so on, that is going on in the different districts.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have no such luxury in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. ROGERS: There is an inspection boat at Halifax and one at St. John. They do not go up the very small rivers.

Public Works—chargeable to collection of revenue—slides and booms, $95,100.

Mr. BUREAU: I find in the Auditor General's Report that over 2,000,000 feet of British Columbia fir was supplied for slides and booms on the St. Maurice river between Shawenegan Falls and Three Rivers, the price paid being $43 per M. feet. Were any tenders asked for this timber and who supplied it?

Mr. ROGERS: The chief engineer does not seem to have that information.

Mr. BUREAU: My reason for asking the question is this. Before the late Government went out of power, whenever any quantity of timber of that character was supplied, prices were asked for from lumbermen or from men handling that line of business. The gentleman who supplied the 2,000,000 feet of lumber and who got $9,000 for it is an undertaker. I have known him for a number of years and the only knowledge he has of the lumber business is in the handling of caskets and coffins. I was wondering how he came to supply this Government with British Columbia fir, when he is not in the business at all.

Mr. ROGERS: We will have to have this matter looked into. It looks a bad case.

Mr. BUREAU: It is rather a bad case. I do not see how it can be that this gentleman, who has been doing nothing but performing the very painful duty of carrying people to their last resting-place, should all of a sudden bob up in Three Rivers and have the supplying of this lumber there. If the old practice had been followed and prices asked from the lumbermen at Three Rivers, which is an important lumbering centre, better prices could have been obtained, and in fact the transaction would not have looked as shady as it looks now. If I could get some explanation, I would be satisfied.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. ROGERS: I told my hon. friend that we have not the information here.

Mr. BUREAU: Can I get it later on?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, I shall be glad to look into the matter.

Mr. McKENZIE: I asked the minister last night if he would be good enough to give me the report of the engineer upon the construction of the breakwater at Jamesville, Victoria county.

Mr. ROGERS: The chief engineer will send you a copy.

Department of Public Works—to appoint E. L. Horwood chief architect at $7,000 per annum from October 1, 1914, $3,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose this item is inserted in this particular manner because Mr. Horwood was not appointed under the Civil Service Act?

Mr. ROGERS: That is correct.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know the gentleman at all or how the appointment came to be made outside of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Horwood is a prominent architect in Ottawa; and when Mr. Ewart asked to be relieved of the duties of his office, we had to find a suitable man to take his place. Mr. Horwood, in the judgment of the department, is the most available man for that particular position. It is evident that the chairman of the Civil Service Commission did not think so, though he was not very definite about it. He wrote a letter, which I forwarded to the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), at his request, and I would ask that hon. gentleman to be good enough to give his friends that letter, which explains the position taken by Mr. Shortt in this matter. We have to have a chief architect, and we could not find a person more suitable for that position, in our judgment, than Mr. Horwood. He had all the qualifications, and Mr. Shortt was not able to supply the name of anybody whom he would recommend.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has Mr. Horwood proven satisfactory to the department?

Mr. ROGERS: He has only been there a few months, but he has done good work.

Mr. GRAHAM: You cannot tell the result of his work yet?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Harbours and rivers—Port Arthur and Fort William—harbour and river improvements—

further amount required, $500,000; Vancouver harbour, B.C.—improvements—further amount required, $350,000—$875,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: How does it come that we have to put in nearly a million dollars after the Estimates are made out?

Mr. ROGERS: In the original Estimates the amount for the harbour at Fort William was very much cut down, and it was found we had not sufficient to carry out the contracts we had let there. The same applies to Vancouver harbour.

Brockville public building—alterations and improvements, $2,400.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is this work on the post office building?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, alterations and improvements.

Mr. GRAHAM: You are not changing the system of letter boxes?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Kemptville public building—additional land required, $1,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is to enlarge the site?

Mr. J. D. REID: At Kemptville, the store of Mundell & Purcell, which was right up against the public building, was burned down, and it has been suggested that it would be well to get that land which is now vacant and add it to the site upon which the public building stands. No other building would then be up against the public building, and it will be quite an improvement.

London fair grounds—rebuilding grand stand, $15,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is this for?

Mr. ROGERS: Last year when the troops were mobilized at London, the owners of the fair grounds put their buildings at the disposal of the Department of Militia. Unfortunately, a fire took place and destroyed the grand stand. It is estimated that it will take $15,000 to make good the loss sustained.

Quebec—Cap de la Madeleine—enlargement of wharf, $6,300.

Mr. BUREAU: This is the famous wharf which is 100 feet long, and for which timber of sufficient length could not be obtained in the district of Three Rivers, which is one of the most important lumber districts in the province of Quebec. The lumber was obtained in British Columbia. This wharf was to be built for the sum of $49,000, and the cost has now run up to $66,000, although not a boat has docked there, and there is no prospect of any boat docking there within the next ten years. I should like to know whether or not this is the end of it.

Mr. ROGERS: This finishes the work.

Ste. Anne de Beaupré—to repair wharf, $19,000.

Mr. BUREAU: What kind of repairs are being made in this case?

Mr. ROGERS: This is for reconstruction.

Mr. McCREA: Has the minister anything in his Estimates for repairs to the wharf at Barachois, Gaspé county? The breakwater there was more or less damaged by ice and water and should be repaired. I have looked through the Estimates, but find no item for it.

Mr. ROGERS: There is apparently nothing in the Estimates.

Mr. McCREA: I think it should be repaired. Repairs are necessary if the breakwater is not to be washed away altogether.

Mr. ROGERS: We will take a memorandum of it.

Hamilton harbour improvements, $250,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the minister doing at Hamilton?

Mr. ROGERS: This is simply a revote from last year which was omitted by mistake from our Estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM: Only $90,000 is a revote. Is it dredging or building of docks or what?

Mr. ROGERS: A revetment wall and dredging in Stype's inlet.

Quebec harbour—river St. Charles—improvements to navigation, $500,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose this vote is for improving the St. Charles river to make it an ocean terminus in connection with the National Transcontinental railway?

Mr. ROGERS: No, the vote has nothing to do with that.

Mr. GRAHAM: The National Transcontinental railway is getting down into the valley of the St. Charles, and, if I remember correctly, one of the reasons for this increased development in the St. Charles is to make it an ocean port for the Transcontinental road instead of having the docks along between Cap Rouge and Champlain market.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend is not quite correct. The St. Charles river is a

separate and distinct work in itself. It is for the development of the river for the advantage of Quebec in providing additional accommodation. The harbour is very short and limited, and it is necessary to develop the St. Charles river in order to give additional space for the number of ships coming in.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is it not nevertheless true that this important work is more costly as they expect to take care of the ocean traffic of the Grand Trunk Pacific at that point rather than in the neighbourhood of the Champlain market?

Mr. ROGERS: No, we have an item for that too.

Mr. GRAHAM: For docks west of the Champlain market?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. A contract was given under the late Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: If I remember correctly certain land was purchased, but I think that under the new scheme there was a proposition to take care of part of the traffic in the St. Charles river rather than at the Champlain market.

Mr. ROGERS: I think that is correct.

Montreal postal station "A," St. James street, $160,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is what is called the Carslake property, is it?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Certain discussion has taken place about this and I think the minister brought down a return concerning it the other day.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, all the information is contained in that return; and I would like my hon. friend to read it and then send it on to his newspaper in Montreal so that the people there would understand it.

Mr. GRAHAM: People are accused of owning things they do not; and, as the hon. member for Edmonton said to-day, sometimes they are very expensive luxuries and even unwelcome attachments. I see no reason for having the item held any longer.

Mr. BUREAU: Before the committee rises I should like to ask the minister what he has decided to do about those two items for Ste. Anne du Saguenay: one is $10,000 for a wharf extension, and the other $10,500 for repairs to wharf. The minister stated that this was a duplicate item, and that he would look into it.

Mr. ROGERS: We have looked into it, and after discussing the matter with the hon. member for St. John, have decided to let both items remain in the Estimates. They were passed some time ago.

Mr. BUREAU: I hope the minister will not forget to bring down to-morrow the explanation he promised me about the lumber that was supplied to D. Larivière, the undertaker.

Mr. ROGERS: I will ask the deputy minister to get the information.

Supplementary Estimates, 1914-1915—Department of Justice, including Penitentiary Branch —contingencies—further amount required, including payment of $400 to Miss Georgie Avery, for temporary services from October 31, 1915, $8,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose this is in violation of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. DOHERTY: This young lady was born in the United States. Her father was naturalized after he and his family had lived for a long period in Canada. The young lady passed her examinations and was accepted by the Civil Service Commission as a British subject, but they afterwards discovered that she was of age when her father became naturalized. She is now taking the regular steps to become naturalized.

Department of Justice—Penitentiaries—Kingston, further amount required, $15,000.

Mr. DOHERTY: I might explain this item. It was found that in view of the increased cost of provisions, supplies, etc., our main Estimate was not sufficient to carry us through the year 1914-15, so these Supplementary Estimates were made last fall. It may be consoling to hon. gentlemen to know that we think we may possibly have made an over-estimate now.

Progress reported.

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER read a communication from the Governor General's Secretary announcing that the Hon. Sir Louis H. Davies, acting as deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General, would proceed to the Senate Chamber on Thursday, the 8th instant, at 4 p.m., for the purpose of giving the Royal Assent to certain Bills.

On motion of Mr. Rogers the House adjourned at 12.03 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Speaker: HON. THOMAS SIMPSON SPROULE.

Thursday, April 8, 1915.

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

THE ALEXANDER DIVORCE BILL.

Mr. G. E. McCRANEY moved:

That Bill No. 118 for the relief of Charles Isaac Alexander be placed on the Order Paper for consideration in the Committee of the Whole.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill was considered in the Senate and passed. It was considered by the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills of the House, and the preamble was rejected by a vote of 7 to 6 on Thursday last. On Monday of this week, I moved to refer the Bill back to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, which was agreed to and the preamble of the Bill was rejected on a vote of 11 to 9. In view of the narrow difference of opinion in the Private Bills Committee, and in view of the fact that the conclusion appears to be at variance with the evidence, I think the Bill should have the attention of the whole House.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Twice this matter has been before the Committee on Private Bills and has been rejected. I, for one, object to its being brought before the House. And, I raise the point of order, as I think I am entitled to do, that the motion cannot be brought forward at this time. If any case clearly indicates the necessity of provision being made by Parliament for the creation of a proper tribunal to consider divorces, it is this. It is the kind of case that should not be thrust upon this House for consideration. I am not a member of the committee, but at this stage of the session I am not disposed to question the conclusion of the committee which twice considered the matter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I supported the motion to refer the case back to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, for reasons which I then stated and to which I still adhere. At that time, I said that the very anomalous result which had been reached, indicated, as has just been pointed out by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett), the necessity for some change in the method by which such cases are disposed of. It occurs to me that the method which has been suggested more than once, that of having these Bills referred to a joint committee of both Houses, so that members of the committee having the Bill under consideration shall hear the witnesses, might be a better method than that which is now in vogue. The Bill was referred back to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and that committee has again decided against reporting the Bill. In the circumstances, while personally, had I been a member of the committee I should have voted to report the Bill, I do not think it is our duty to further deal with the question in this House. The rule has been in the past that the report of a committee upon a Bill should command the approval of the House unless there are very cogent and convincing reasons to the contrary, and notwithstanding that rule, I supported the motion to refer the Bill back. But now that it has been twice considered by the committee, it seems to me that the Bill must be dealt with in accordance with the views of the majority of the committee, and that no good purpose would be served, under present conditions, by asking the House to undertake consideration of a question which, although it is within the judgment of the House, is nevertheless primarily within the judgment of the committee to whom the Bill has been twice confided. I regret therefore that I cannot support the motion of my hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney).

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF: If this Bill is knocked out it will be in my opinion a travesty on justice and it shows the absurdity of the Parliament of Canada dealing with divorces at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member, it seems to me, is exceeding his rights when he reflects upon Parliament in that way.

Mr. TURRIFF: If Parliament throws out this Bill it will deserve to be reflected upon. There would be absolutely no justice in such procedure, because probably not more than a third or a fourth of the membership of the committee was present. If this is to be the final judgment of Parliament on a Bill of this kind, then the sooner Parliament appoints a court to deal with divorce cases, the better it will be for the honour of the Dominion of Canada.

Motion negatived.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

THE STEAMER NOREEN.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Is the steamer Noreen chartered by any department of the Government for service at Halifax?

2. If so, (a) who is the owner, (b) from whom is the said steamer chartered, (c) what services does the boat perform, (d) what is the price paid per day, (e) what is the number and the names of the crew, and what wages do they receive?

3. If he provides coal, oil and supplies?

4. (a) On what date was this steamer first chartered, (b) what is the total sum so far paid to date for such charter, (c) and how much money has been expended by the Government since then in the repair and maintenance of the said steamer?

5. Does the charterer or the Government pay wharfage charges?

6. (a) Was the Noreen formerly called the Lily? (b) If so, was she then condemned by the Government steamboat inspector?

7. Did the Government sell the Lily? If so, when, and to whom, and for what price?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Owner, A. B. Crosby. (b) Charterer, A. B. Crosby. (c) Is employed transporting Marine Department employees between Halifax and Dartmouth. (d) Price, $20 per day. (e) Charterer supplies crew of three men. No information as to names or wages. Government provides one man to handle moorings, gangway and freight.

3. The Government provides coal and water; the charterer oil and supplies.

4. (a) 18th September, 1914. (b) 14th September to 28th February, $2,800. (c) Coal and water, $506. This vessel was employed from August 31 to September 5, 1914, 6 days at $25 per day, transporting equipment from dockyard to Dartmouth. Owner provided crew and all supplies.

5. There are no wharfage charges.

6. (a) Yes. (b) No.

7. Yes; 31st January, 1912; to Messrs. A. B. Crosby Co. for $900. The steamer has since been re-built by the purchaser.

PURCHASE OF LAND FROM J. A. WESTMAN.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Has the Government bought any land from J. A. Westman, in the province of Saskatchewan?

2. If so, where is the land, and what price was paid for it?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Yes.

2. (a) At Regina, Sask., the rear parts of lots Nos. 40, 39, 38 and 37, block 306, southwest corner of Hamilton street and 11th avenue. (b) The land was expropriated on the 23rd February, 1914, and an advance of $50,000 has been paid, without prejudice, to Mr. Westman, who is asking $90,000 for the land; according to information filed with the Exchequer Court; the Crown is prepared to pay $75,000.

CANADIAN WHEATLANDS COMPANY—SEED GRAIN.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Did the Government supply any seed grain for the farming land owned by the Canadian Wheatlands Company at Suffield, Alta., and leased to other parties for operation this year?

2. If so, how much seed was advanced, and how many acres are to be placed under crop?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

PICTOU COUNTY RURAL MAIL ROUTES.

Mr. McCURDY:

1. How many rural mail delivery routes have been established in Pictou county?

2. What are their names, the length of each, and the date when each was put into operation?

3. What is the name and length of each proposed route reported on, apart from above, but not yet put into operation?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. 17.

2. Beaver Bank No. 1, 8 miles, July 1, 1911; Eureka No. 1, 26 miles, Jan. 1, 1915; Glengarry station No. 1, 9 miles, May 19, 1913; Glengarry station No. 2, 19 miles, Oct. 16, 1913; Hopewell No. 1, 18 miles, May 19, 1913; Hopewell No. 2, 12 miles, Oct. 16, 1913; Meadowville station No. 1, 15 miles, Oct. 1, 1913; Merigonish No. 1, 24 miles, Feb. 11, 1914; New Glasgow No. 1, 7½ miles, Aug. 1, 1910; New Glasgow No. 2, 21½ miles, April 16, 1913; New Glasgow No. 3, 18 miles, Jan. 1, 1915; Pictou No. 1, 20 miles, Jan. 1, 1915; Salt Springs No. 1, 11 miles, May 1, 1913; Scotsburn station No. 1, 30 miles, Jan. 1, 1913; Stellarton No. 1, 10½ miles, Nov. 17, 1913; West Branch River John, No. 1 (in part), 11 miles, Aug. 19, 1913; West River station No. 1, 16 miles, May 1, 1913.

3. Alma No. 1, mileage, 16; Little Harbour No. 1, mileage, 8; New Glasgow No. 4, mileage, 22; Pictou No. 2, mileage, 21; River John No. 1, mileage, 17; River John No. 2, mileage, 14; River John No. 3, mileage, 14; Salt Springs No. 2, 13; Scotsburn station No. 2, mileage, 14; Scotsburn station No. 3, mileage, 21; Scotsburn station No. 4, mileage, 11½; Westville No. 1, mileage, 24; Westville No. 2, mileage, 19.

The contracts have been awarded for these routes, but service is not yet in operation.

WAR SUPPLIES—BINOCULARS.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Regarding the purchase of binoculars for the Canadian forces, did the Minister of Militia, in appointing P. W. Ellis and Company as purchasing agents, receive any recommendation, verbal or otherwise, in favour of that firm from W. K. MacNaught, of Toronto?

2. If not, did the minister receive any recommendation from any other person? If so, from whom?

Major General HUGHES:

1. No.

2. No recommendation was needed. The members of the firm are known throughout the Empire for their high and honourable dealing. The minister has known them personally and intimately since boyhood.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Bureau: For a return showing the number of employees connected with the administration of the Three Rivers post office on the 21st September, 1911, and the annual amount paid in salaries at that date for such service.

2. The number of employees connected with the administration of the Three Rivers post office at the present date, and the amount of the annual salaries paid for such service.

3. The number of employees in the Customs Department for Three Rivers on the 21st September, 1911, and the amount of the annual salaries paid for such service.

4. The number of employees in the Customs Department for Three Rivers at the present date, and the annual amount of the salaries paid for such service.

5. The number of employees in the Inland Revenue Department for the district of Three Rivers on the 21st September, 1911, and the annual amount of salaries paid for such service.

6. The number of employees at the present date in the Inland Revenue Department for the district of Three Rivers, and the amount of the annual salaries paid for such service.

7. The number of employees, and the amount paid in salaries for the works on the St. Maurice, in the county of Champlain, during the year 1911-1912.

8. The number of employees, and the amount of salaries paid per year for the works on the St. Maurice, in the county of Champlain, since 1911-1912.

9. Whether the employees whose names follow were dismissed on the 26th and 27th November, 1914, and the 4th and 5th January, 1915: Wildé Lavallée, Pierre Thivierge, Joseph Paquin, sr., Joseph Paquin, jr., Athanase Gélinas, clerk.

10. If so, at whose request, and for what reasons.

11. Whether those days were taken off the salaries of such employees.

Mr. Boulay: For a return showing the names of the persons who have successfully passed the Civil Service examinations in the province of Quebec since the establishment of the Civil Service Commission. 2. How many such persons have been called upon to enter the Civil Service. 3. The number in each grade of those who have passed such examinations with success.

WAR SUPPLIES—CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. GRAHAM moved:

For a copy of all correspondence that has taken place since August 4th last, between any official of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Prime Minister, the acting Prime Minister, or any member of the Government, concerning the purchase of war supplies by the Government or any department thereof.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend referred to this matter during my absence, and I observe that he made a further reference to it last evening. A communication was received from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, which, according to their view, was of a confidential character, I asked particularly as to that in a later letter. I have no objection to bring the correspondence down, but as the correspondence has apparently been communicated to the hon. member for South Renfrew, although it was represented to me as confidential, I shall certainly ask the Association for leave to have it brought down. It would have been more appropriate, perhaps, if the persons concerned had given me their permission in the first instance.

Mr. GRAHAM: I can assure my right hon. friend that I have not the correspondence, and have never seen it. If my right hon. friend will bring it down, that will answer the purpose.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will bring it down after communicating with them, and if there is no objection.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I rise to a question of privilege. A leaflet has been placed in my hands which purports on the face of it to be published by the Federal Press Agency, 47 Slater Street, Ottawa, Canada, the central publication and distribution office of the Conservative party of Canada. The leaflet reads:

Laurier and Quebec.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier once declared that if the Empire was ever in peril he would be "the first to stump Quebec.' Well, the Empire was in peril—the greatest peril it has ever faced. Did he stump Quebec? Did he call for French Canadian recruits? Not a bit of it. His lips were sealed in so far as any appeal to his fellow-countrymen was concerned. Why? Because Laurier, now as ever, cares not a whit for the Empire. Vote Conservative, for Borden backs Britain.

It is very seldom, Mr. Speaker, that I trouble the House with anything which concerns myself personally, with anything relating to opinions, speeches, actions, or

omissions on my part, but the statement contained in this leaflet is so absolutely contrary to the facts that I think I am justified in calling the attention of the House and of the country to it. The question is asked:

Did he call for French-Canadian recruits? Not a bit of it.

As to my action in that regard, I have only to call to witness my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain). I attended a meeting in the city of Montreal with my hon. friend, who was then a private citizen, but who, I understand, came, directed by the Government, just for the purpose of asking French-Canadians to recruit. I addressed other public meetings in Montreal on the same line, and on every occasion I gave evidence that my heart was very much in this fight in which England is now engaged. I have addressed meetings wherever there was occasion to do so and I would have done more if more had been needed; but I had the testimony of the Prime Minister himself and of the Minister of Militia that French Canadians had answered nobly to the appeal, and that they had done as much as any of their fellow countrymen of English or of other origin. This morning I have a letter stating that French Canadians are crowding the recruiting offices and are being refused because for some reason no more are needed. In the face of this I characterize this leaflet as a falsehood and a malignant libel and slander.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to say from the Chair that, while I would not regard this as a matter of privilege according to my understanding of privilege, it is quite proper that the right hon. gentleman should draw attention to this leaflet as he has done and deny it if he wishes to do so.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The leaflet to which the right hon. gentleman alludes did not come to my attention, but I would like to inform him that he is not the only person upon whom animadversions have been made. I recollect that last autumn, when I was working at my duties from 16 to 18 hours a day, and remaining at my post against the advice of my physician, organs of the Liberal party, or some of them, in the province of Ontario, were attacking me because they said that not one single patriotic word had emanated from the lazy lips of Sir Robert Borden since the outbreak of the war.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Was that in a newspaper?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, from a very well recognized organ of hon. gentlemen opposite and during a period when they claimed to be observing a truce. Further than that, afterwards, when I did go forth to deliver certain addresses in this country which contained, in the judgment of every man in this country, not one controversial word, the same organs which had denounced me for holding my peace charged me with conducting a political compaign.

INQUIRIES FOR PAPERS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. MACDONALD: At an earlier period of the session I called the attention of the Minister of Labour to the necessity of sending a fair-wage officer to New Glasgow in connection with certain contracts. I understand an officer has been there. Would the minister be good enough to bring down his report?

Mr. CROTHERS: One of my officers has been in the Maritime Provinces for three or four weeks and I understand that he is preparing his report now. I have had a talk with him about what he saw in the different factories there, but I have not yet received his report. I will be very glad to bring it down when I receive it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: During the session I moved for the following returns: On March 29, for papers in respect to the dismissal of Joseph C. Lavers and John Connolly, of the Customs Service, Halifax; on March 24, for a return of papers in relation to lands expropriated by the Halifax and Eastern Railway; on March 17, for a return of papers in reference to the Atlantic ocean freight rates on subsidized steamers; on the same date for papers referring to the leasing of the Windsor branch of the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway; on the same date for papers relating to amounts paid for Fenian Raid bounties to persons in Halifax county; on the 26th February, for papers relative to the dismissal from the post office of John Thomas, of English Corner, Halifax county. I would ask that these returns be brought down before the close of the session.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Do they all relate to one department?

Mr. MACLEAN: No, to different departments, and that is why I wish to have my request on Hansard.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman would send a memorandum to each of the ministers involved it would probably expedite the production of the papers.

CANADA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved the third reading of Bill No. 112, to amend the Canada Grain Act:

Mr. TURRIFF: I notice that in the amendment submitted by the minister there is no provision for settling cases of shortages of grain from one elevator to another, that is from an elevator in the West to a terminal elevator at the head of the lakes. I would ask if the minister proposes to make such a provision later on?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The legislation which is here proposed has been suggested, and in my opinion is rendered necessary because of a particular phase of the grain transport business having to do with shortages which occur between the elevators at Fort William or Port Arthur and elevators in the East, on the lake carrying route. All parties to this controversy have been heard by the Government or by my department, and they have all had their opportunity to make their representations. At the close of a session it is not advisable to bring in very important legislation affecting large interests and to pass it through the House. My warrant for asking the House to pass this is, as I have stated, that all parties have presented their cases and we have full information. The other suggestion of my hon. friend which would involve the settlement of all shortages from the place of production to the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur is a very much larger question in its way, and, if anything, a more important question. We are taking this step at this time on a very important section, involving somewhat the same principle as his suggestion. We will see how that works out during the year and then be in a better position to decide what measures may be taken in that or some other direction in a succeeding year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am in receipt this morning of a letter coming from a prominent gentleman connected with lake navigation and the carrying of grain. He represents to me that this legislation has been hasty and is not fair to the navigation interests. I shall read the concluding portion of the letter:

> Apparently the unloading elevators have taken the position, which I assumed they would take, and I understand now that on Saturday the minister gave some explanation to the House stating that the shippers, outloaders, and the carriers are agreeable to having the amendment to the Grain Act put through and that only some of the eastern elevators object.
>
> I feel it only right that I should explain the situation to you and point out that as a vessel manager I do not agree with this proposed amendment at all, as it is no way to remedy one evil by creating another, or correcting the evil unfairly at the expense of every one interested.

I have no opinion of my own to express on this matter, for it is a very technical subject, and I am sure that only a few of us can understand it; but I thought it well to bring to the attention of the minister this protest from a man who is very prominently connected with the lake commerce.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Of course it is very difficult for all parties to see eye to eye on a question of this kind. The correspondent of my right hon. friend is probably objecting to the compromise arrangement which it is proposed to make, and in reference to which representatives of all the different interests were called together. My right hon. friend will see that this legislation gives the Grain Commission power to take what measures seem to them right in order to settle the shortages. So far as this letter is a protest, it is a protest against something which has fallen through and not a protest against handing over this matter to the responsible management of the Grain Commission who really know more about this than any of us, and whose interests in the question are, I think, not only very intelligent but very sympathetic.

Mr. OLIVER: I desire to move an amendment to the motion for the third reading of this Bill, not for the purpose of dividing the House, but for the purpose of getting an expression of opinion. I beg to move:

> That the Bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amendment by striking out the word "shipper" where it occurs in the sixth line of section 120 (a).

The purpose of the Bill is to authorize the Grain Commission to examine into any question of shortage; to make a finding in regard to that shortage and to enforce that finding. Now the only parties who can be responsible for the shortage are, first, the elevator operators at the western lake terminal; secondly, the elevator operators at the eastern lake terminal, and thirdly, the carriers between

those two points. One of those three must be responsible for the shortage. So far as I understand the matter, there is no way in which the shipper can be responsible for the shortage; and if the shipper cannot be responsible for the shortage, power should not be placed in the hands of the Grain Commission to hold him responsible. I do not imagine that the Grain Commission would give a decision laying the responsibility on the shipper when it did not rest there, but I think it very undesirable that the legislation should contain the suggestion that the shipper may be held responsible when he cannot possibly protect himself against that responsibility. The shipper, whether he ships from an interior point or from a terminal elevator, ships subject to the weighing in and to the weighing out of the terminal, by officials of this Government over whom a shipper has not and cannot have any control. Neither has he any control over the carrier nor over the eastern receiving elevator. Therefore the shipper cannot be held responsible in any degree for the shortage in shipments through Fort William. When his grain is received into the elevator he gets credit only for the grain that is weighed in by the Government weighmaster, and from the time that the grain is taken in hand by the Government weighmaster the shipper has no control whatever over it. Therefore, the shipper should not be placed on the list of those responsible for a possible shortage in the weight between the shipping elevator and the eastern port of delivery.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to point out that this amendment is hardly in the proper form. It asks that the Bill be referred back for the purpose of striking out certain words instead of asking that the Bill be referred back for further consideration.

Mr. WRIGHT: The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) is dealing with something that does not come within the scope of this Bill. The original shipper does not ship through the terminal elevators but to them and he is left entirely out of the question after the grain has been weighed in. From that point forward the shipment is by an entirely different party. There must be some method I apprehend of determining the amount of grain that goes into a vessel at Fort William for instance, and I do not know any very good reason why the man who loads the vessel with grain there should not be held accountable for the amount of grain he claims to put into that vessel. If he does not put in the number of bushels that he charges up to the buyer, there ought to be some method of determining that the proper amount has not gone into the vessels. If there is a shortage when the grain arrives at the eastern port, whether Montreal, Midland, Port Colborne, Goderich, or any of the other numerous places in the east to which grain is shipped, it does not necessarily follow that it is the fault of the lake carriers or even of those who have control of the grain at the eastern port. The shortage might be accounted for by the fact that the proper amount of grain was not put into the vessel at Fort William or whatever the shipping point was. The people in the Prairie provinces and further west would have no concern in that shortage at all. They are entirely through with the grain as soon as it lands at the elevator at the head of the Lakes. I may be mistaken, but I think the idea the hon. member for Edmonton had in mind was that these people would still be responsible if a shortage was found at the eastern point of delivery. That is entirely distinct from the object of the Bill. This legislation is not intended to touch the question of any shortage that might arise between the loading by the farmer or by the small elevator man in the West and the large elevator at the head of the Lakes.

Mr. ROBB: When this Bill was in committee additions were made to section 4, and I notice that in both 120a and 120b, which were added to section 4 the word " shippers" appears. In answer to my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. Wright) who is a grain grower in the West, let me point out this. He ships down from his farm in Saskatchewan to Fort William 10,000 bushels of wheat; when it reaches Fort William the elevator man takes it in and gives him a certificate for 9,900 bushels, which is 100 bushels short; he sends down that certificate and the bills of lading to the elevator man who took it in at Fort William, and says: Ship this wheat to James Richardson & Son at Kingston; they weigh it into the boat and ship it to Goderich for account of James Richardson & Sons, and when it reaches Goderich they say that there are only 9,800 bushels—does the hon. gentleman think that he as a shipper should be held responsible for the loss of that second hundred bushels?

Mr. WRIGHT : The hon. gentleman is conjuring up a thoroughly imaginary proposition.

Mr. NEELY: That is exactly what is done.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is exactly what is not done.

Mr. NEELY: It happens very frequently.

Mr. WRIGHT: I beg to differ from my hon. friend. Everybody knows that the farmer of the West does not ship to the terminal elevators and does not load a vessel with grain going down to the big elevators on the lakes. There are not many farmers in the West who can load a quarter of a million bushels of grain through the elevator. The weight of the grain is finally determined when it goes into the terminal elevator at the head of the lakes unless it may be that he is shipping a carload of grain direct all rail and it goes down to a mill in the East. But if it is the intention to provide some kind of a remedy for the farmer of the West who might be subject to shortage, I think the question will have to be dealt with separately. It should not be mixed up with the question of the transportation of grain in the Great Lake carriers. The grain loses its distinctive individuality and there is no method of identifying the farmer's grain after it has gone into the lake vessel. It is all put in the hold of the vessel and it would be almost impossible to trace it through the terminal elevators at Fort William and away back to the loading platform of the farmer who originally shipped it.

Mr. SPEAKER: As the hon. gentleman has already spoken he could not properly go beyond an explanation in reference to the question raised by the hon. member on this side of the House.

Mr. WRIGHT: I was only trying to touch the point raised by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb). I had no intention of going into the question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: While I see some force in the argument of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that in the general course of events it could not be that the shipper entered into the question as to the responsibility for shortage, still, one can conceive of a case where possibly he might do so. I do not look upon it as a case between the Western farmer and the elevator companies or lake carriers. The shipper is in another category altogether. He is not an exporter on the one hand or a farmer on the other. He is a grain dealer usually operating on the grain exchange at Winnipeg. However, the question comes in here: the lake carrier seems to be of the view that the shipper is the man who should in general be responsible. Whether they are correct in that view or not, they take that view and they press it very strongly. Consequently, if we are to relegate to the Grain Commission we should relegate the whole question and let them decide it. Although we feel that the shipper should in general be exempt from the question, still it is evident that when we are relegating to the commission we should let the commission decide that as well as the rest. We give them no directions at all. We simply say that if in any specific case you will find the shipper has gained an advantage where the grain has been overweighed out of the elevator you have a right to adjust it accordingly. If they agree with the hon. member for Edmonton that in any case he should not be responsible, they will not hold him responsible. Surely it is the duty of the House, when we are submitting the question to a tribunal, because we cannot bring the parties to the question together, not to tie the hands of the tribunal but to submit to such tribunal the whole question and not a part alone.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know that I can say anything to reinforce what has been already said, and particularly what has been said by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Meighen), but there are two main facts in connection with it. In the first place, it is not, I think, pertinent to try to confuse the original producer of the grain, in the guise of the small farmer, or even of the comparatively large farmer, with the shipper. He is largely the shipper of the grain from the locality but very often sells to the street buyer or the track buyer and so he has no interest in the grain thereafter. In many cases he ships from the loading platform and in many other cases he sends in quantities through the local elevator. He is the shipper in these cases, but the facts of the case are that when you come to ship out from the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, the original farmer is almost entirely eliminated. The grain at that point has got into the hands of the intermediate and large buyers and they are the people who are the shippers from that point on. The farmer, away

back in the producing centre, has very little interest as far as this legislation is concerned. The other fact is this: We have in this measure worked out an arrangement. If this measure is thought to be wise, we are handing over the matter of the adjustment of this much vexed question to a body which has more experience than we have, and it is only right that we should give to them broad powers to make the adjustment between all concerned. It is true in a sense that the shipper has no mechanical interest in, or power over, his grain after it has been weighed out of the Government elevator and the weight has been adduced. That is true, but he is still the owner of the grain and he has chief interest in it. In the case of the overweighing of grain, where it would be to the advantage of the shipper he should not be eliminated from the adjustment. The third fact is that it must be borne in mind that we are simply relegating this question to the board which understands the matter and will take every one of these interests into consideration. If the shipper has no interest, and it will so appear to them, he does not come into the adjustment at all, but if there is an interest and it so appears to them, why should we limit their power to spread the adjustment over all the parties to the transaction? I trust that my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) will not press his motion. This is a small piece of legislation which has been very carefully thought over and discussed with the Board of Grain Commissioners, and we have put it in about the best possible way we could. I should be disposed to think that the House would be well advised to just let it go through without proposing further amendments. At the same time it is quite open to any one to press his views.

Mr. OLIVER: Have I the right to say a word now in conclusion?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is with the consent of the House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to trespass on the House, but I thought it was my prerogative.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not on a substantive motion.

Mr. OLIVER: Well, then, I will not say anything.

[Sir George E. Foster.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no objection.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to prolong the discussion at all. I wish to correct the impression that seems to have occurred to the mind of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright), and to that of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), that I was particularly advocating the case of the rural producer and outside shipper. He was not the person I had in mind at all; I was dealing with the shipper as he is generally understood, and on representations made to me which seemed to be concurred in by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and by the Solicitor General, that it being perfectly clear that the shipper was not and could not be in any degree responsible for the shortages, he certainly should not be, so to speak, on the Indian list, subject to the discretion of the Board of Grain Commissioners. I am quite satisfied with the good faith of the Board of Grain Commissioners, and of their readiness to do what is right; but we are supposed to have responsibility and to exercise it in this House of Commons, and if we are satisfied that two and two actually make four, I do not think we are entitled to put in our legislation a suggestion that on the opinion of some one else two and two may make five. This is a question of absolute fact as to the lack of responsibility on the part of the shipper, and that being an absolute and established fact, I cannot agree that it is wise legislation to turn over to the Board of Grain Commissioners the authority to say differently. Let the Minister of Trade and Commerce, if he wishes, put it this way, that if the Board of Grain Commissioners on their examining into the question find that in a possible case the shipper may have responsibility, then they can make representations to this House and we can amend our legislation accordingly. I think that would be the fairer way to deal with the matter.

The principal purpose that I had in moving the amendment on the first new section was in its relation to the second section which I will deal with when this amendment has been disposed of. The matter comes up much more directly on the second section than on the first, but in order to have the case in line in both sections, it was necessary to make this amendment in regard to the first section.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will not have the right to move another amend-

ment, because he has now exhausted his right to speak on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER: Then might I add what I wish to say in regard to the second section? I was under the impression that I could move an amendment to each section and speak on each amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I reminded the hon. member that his original motion was not in proper form—that it should be that the Bill be referred back to the committee for further consideration, but not on any one section. That I understood was done.

Amendment (Mr. Oliver) negatived.

Mr. KNOWLES: I desire to move in amendent:

That this Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration for the purpose of amendment by striking out the words "and shippers" where they occur in the seventh line of section 120 (b) and by inserting the word "and" between the words "operators" and "water-carriers," where they occur in the sixth line of the said section.

Mr. SPEAKER: This amendment in my judgment is out of order. When a Bill is referred to a committee, it is in order to give instructions to that committee to do certain things that otherwise it has not the power to do. The Committee of the Whole has the power to do, without instructions from the House, what the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) desires done, when the Bill has been referred back for further consideration, and as that amendment has been negatived already this amendment is out of order.

12 noon.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

PROPOSED GOVERNMENT OPERATION.

On motion of Hon. Frank Cochrane (Minister of Railways and Canals), Bill No. 119, to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act, was read the third time, and passed.

WINDING-UP ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), Bill No. 122, to amend the Winding-Up Act, was read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

SOLDIERS' VOTING BILL.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 111, to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will the hon. gentleman please explain this Bill, we have had no information so far.

Mr. DOHERTY: The purpose of this Bill is to enable Canadians on active military service, whether in this country or outside of Canada, to exercise their electoral franchise. Under the provisions of this Bill, every soldier, twenty-one years of age and a British subject, will be entitled to vote in the event of occasion arising for him to exercise that right. That vote he will be entitled to have recorded within the electoral district wherein he has resided for thirty days preceding his enlistment or enrolment. That is the general rule proposed with regard to the locality as to which this right to vote shall be exercised. There is, however, a proviso that where any soldier has a right to vote, irrespective of this Bill, in any particular electoral district, he shall vote in that electoral district, and, of course in that electoral district only.

To provide means to enable the soldier upon active service to register his vote is the purpose of the great bulk of the provisions of the Bill. The system may be summarized as follows: It is proposed that upon this law being enacted, ballots should be prepared sufficient in number for the number of men who may be entitled to exercise the right under this Bill.

Mr. MARCIL: Prepared by whom?

Mr. DOHERTY: Printed as we would print ballots for any ordinary election. There would be prepared also a form of affidavit to be made by the soldier who votes under this Bill, and a form of certificate to be given by the officer, who, under the Act would receive the ballots. These ballots being printed, a sufficient quantity would be sent to the different officers commanding at the military bases in Canada, to the officer commanding the Canadian troops in Bermuda, and to the office of the High Commissioner in London, whose secretary is constituted the custodian of these ballots. In the event of a writ being issued for an election, the fact would be at once communicated to the different officers commanding both in Canada and in Bermuda, and

to the secretary of the High Commissioner's office in London. In the two latter cases, it would probably have to be done by telegraph, and provision is made for it being so done. On the receipt of this information, it becomes the duty of the custodians of these ballots to make a distribution of them to the persons entitled to receive them. As regards the commanding officers in Canada and Bermuda, that distribution would be made directly to the soldiers under their command. With regard to the ballot for the soldiers overseas, on receipt of information of the issue of an election writ, it would become the duty of the secretary of the High Commissioner to see that these ballots are forwarded to the different officers commanding the several units wherever they may be found. The method provided whereby the soldier is to vote is that being furnished with a ballot, he shall mark the ballot in the presence of a commissioned officer, but shall so mark it that while the officer shall be in a position to know that it is the soldier himself who marks the ballot, he will not be able to know in what way he marks it; that is, he will not be able to know how the soldier votes.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the officer be sworn?

Mr. DOHERTY: As the power is conferred on commissioned officers, the Bill does not propose to require an oath from the officer in regard to the matter. It was considered that we might entrust that duty to the officer in his official capacity. If, on consideration of the Bill, the sense of the House should be that it would be desirable that the officer be sworn particularly for the purpose, I do not know that there would be any material objection to that being done. The ballots having been marked in the presence of the officer, the soldier also would make an affidavit as to his qualifications and as to the place in which he had resided before his enlistment or his address in any electoral district in which he may have had a vote irrespective of this Bill. The affidavit is to be sworn before the officer and attested by the officer. The ballot and the affidavit will be enclosed in an envelope and sealed by the officer who will also endorse upon the back of it a certificate that the person who made the enclosed affidavit is known to him as a member of his company, platoon, or whatever the subdivision may be and as the person whose name appears, and that, to the best of the officer's knowledge, the statements in the affidavit made by the soldier are true, these envelopes will be addressed and forwarded by mail to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. It will become the duty of that officer, upon receipt of these ballots, to distribute them among the different electoral districts in which the votes are to be registered. In what electoral district the vote contained in a given envelope is to be cast will appear, of course, by the attestation on the exterior of the envelope made by the officer. On the face of that will appear the address given by the soldier. It was suggested that the soldier should state the electoral district; but it was pointed out that, particularly in view of our recent redistribution, there might be confusion as to the exact title of the district. With the address given it will be a simple matter for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to distribute the ballots to the several districts in which they should be registered.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has the Government a complete list of the names, post office addresses and residences of all the men who have enlisted?

Mr. DOHERTY: No; I do not think we have in our possession a list that would show the residences of all the men who have gone to the front. My right hon. friend suggests that we should, because of this, withdraw this Bill, but I do not think that that is a reason why we should do so. The committee had knowledge of that fact when they were considering the Bill, and I do not myself see that the absence of a list, showing the former residences of those at the front is an insuperable obstacle to the carrying out of this proposed legislation. Only the other day Parliament went on record in support of the maintenance of the law providing that in one or more of the provinces of this Dominion a man presenting himself to a returning officer and swearing to his qualifications was entitled to have his vote recorded.

Mr. TURRIFF: But representatives of both candidates are present at the time.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that, and before I have finished my explanation it will be seen that representatives of both candidates will control, to some extent at least, these declarations of the soldiers. In principle, if the soldier swears to his qualifications, I think that we may at least give to him the same credence that we give to voters in certain of the provinces of this Dominion. It is not considered an insup-

erable obstacle to their voting that there is not in existence an exact list showing where their residences have been in the past or what their qualifications are. I do not quite see that we should refuse to the soldier whose name is not on a list what we are willing to give to the citizen who is in the same position. It will appear on the certificate on the exterior of the envelope where the ballot ought to be deposited, and it will be the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, having received this envelope sealed, to affix his own seal to it, and, putting together in one parcel all the envelopes that belong to a particular electoral district, to forward the bundle, properly sealed by himself, to the returning officer for that electoral district. Upon the receipt of such parcel containing ballots of this kind, it will become the duty of the returning officer to notify the candidates or their representatives that he has received such a parcel of ballots and that he will proceed, upon the day fixed for the election, at a certain hour after the close of the polls, to open this parcel and to deposit the ballots contained therein. In that way the candidates or their representatives will be enabled to control the operations of the returning officers in regard to these ballots. The ballot, when marked by the soldier, is to be folded, as all ballots are, in such manner that it will not appear on the exterior how he has voted. The returning officer, having given the notice mentioned, is on the polling day to proceed to open the parcel in the presence of the candidates or their representatives, and, having submitted the exterior of the envelopes to the examination of the parties interested, if there be no objection, it is his duty to open the envelopes, withdraw the affidavits and submit them to the candidates and their representatives. These being found regular and satisfactory, he is to take the ballot from the envelope and drop them in the ballot box, just as the deputy returnng officer takes the ballot from any voter who presents himself at the poll and drops it into the ballot box. These ballots so dropped into the box will be counted and credited to the representatives of the parties for whom these votes have been cast.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What safeguards are there that the ballots marked by the soldiers will be the ballots returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery?

Mr. DOHERTY: The safeguards are, that that ballot is, in the presence of the soldier, inserted in an envelope sealed by his officer.

Mr. GERMAN: The Bill does not say "sealed."

Mr. DOHERTY: If it does not say "sealed," but we can provide for that. Certainly the intention was that it should.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What puzzles me is what absolute safeguard there will be.

Mr. DOHERTY: If we are looking for absolute safeguards, I do not think that we can find them. We have to trust men in respect to the voting that is done at home; and notwithstanding all the precautions that we take, a dishonest officer can act dishonestly and defeat the purpose of the law.

Mr. GERMAN: When there are scrutineers at his elbow, acting on behalf of both parties, he cannot very well act wrongly, but there are no scrutineers at the front.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are no scrutineers at the front, nor will the ballot be deposited in the box at the front. What we have at the front is the commissioned officer of the men who are voting. We are, therefore, confiding to the commissioned officers of our troops the confidence that we give to the deputy returning officers in this country; and if that is a risk that we should not take, we have to admit that we are taking it. But I do not think that it can be suggested that we cannot place the same confidence in our officers who are at the front that we put in the deputy returning officers who are selected by the returning officers to preside over the operations that take place at the polls.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the minister mean that the only difference in the way of safeguards is that the commissioned officer is substituted for the deputy returning officer, and that in all other respects the safeguards are as great in the one case as in the other.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is not the presence or representatives of candidates; that is true.

Mr. MARCIL: And the officers are not sworn.

Mr. DOHERTY: As I said to the hon. member, if it is considered necessary that we should swear these officers for this particular duty, personally I would see no objection to its being done. It is not provided in the Bill. As the matter presented

itself to the minds of those who submitted the Bill to the House, it did not appear to be necessary. It seemed to us that the honest performance of this duty might have been entrusted to an officer in his capacity of officer, relying upon the traditional honour of one who is an officer and a gentleman.

Mr. MARCIL: We swear our own returning officers.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, and I am not suggesting that it might not be advisable to swear the officers.

Mr. TURRIFF: Would the minister think it perfectly safe to leave the handing of the vote to deputy returning officers without scrutineers of either party being present?

Mr. DOHERTY: I wish to state frankly now that if the view put forward is that before the soldier votes we must surround his vote with all of the protections which surround the vote of a man in this country, this Bill does not attain that object. Those who submitted this Bill thought, however, that the right in the exercise of which this Bill seeks to protect the soldier was of such importance that we should be willing, providing we had reasonable precautions, to waive some of the details of the operations that surround the voting at home.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The minister has stated that some certain provision was recommended by somebody in the committee. I would like to have it understood that this Bill has not been recommended by the committee. It was opposed by the minority of the committee and was not even recommended by anybody on the committee. Probably there is no difference between us on that.

Mr. DOHERTY: Absolutely none. I said when the Bill was laid before the House that the committee was not making a recommendation, was not unanimous in submitting it to the House, that the minority of the committee did not approve either of the measure in principle or of the method provided in the Bill for giving it effect; and I did not say that the committee had recommended this. I said that those who did recommend it took this responsibility. I do not hesitate to say that, so far as I am personally concerned—and I think I speak in that regard for a majority of the committee—we do recommend this Bill to the favourable consideration of the House.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You do not do it very strongly.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do it just as I do everything that I do, I do it sincerely. The strength with which I may do it depends on the force that my representations may exercise upon the judgment of the House, but I am prepared to say that I put this measure forward with all the sincerity with which I have ever put forward any measure. I am prepared to admit that it may be open to criticism in its details, and I am of course prepared to admit that there may be gentlemen in this House who can suggest a better method of carrying out what is proposed to be carried out; but in so far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, I would be surprised to find that there was not a general consensus that if this thing can be, and I believe it can be, properly carried out, we should see to it that the soldier who has sacrificed so much in order to do our work and to carry Canada's honour through this struggle, should not be asked in addition to all his other sacrifices to make the sacrifice of his right to have his voice heard in the determination of the public questions of this country. I did not think it was necessary for me to endeavour to make any extra evidence of the strength of my convictions, because I fancied that was a conviction that was shared by everybody.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister gives the votes to those who are voters as well as to those who are not voters.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes; we endeavour to secure to the man who is a voter a manner by which he can exercise his vote. But we say that the man who is a soldier and a British subject engaged actively in the service of this country and of the Empire shall have a vote for that reason, even if there be no other reason why he should have a vote. Somebody has said that the men who are good enough to do our fighting are good enough to do some of our voting.

Mr. MARCIL: Why do you not leave out those who are under 21 years of age?

Mr. DOHERTY: In that regard I think it might be fair that we should make that requirement of a man being of age. I would not very strongly resist a suggestion in this connection.

Mr. GERMAN: Why leave out the men serving in the navy?

Mr. DOHERTY: Because as far as we could ascertain, their number is very few. However, if hon. gentlemen's only objection to the Bill is that we have left out the men who are serving in the navy, I am sure, speaking for the majority of the committee, we shall be most happy to include the men serving in the navy. The Bill was originally drafted in that way, but two things were pointed out: In the first place, that the number of men serving in the navy who were properly speaking Canadians was very small, and, in the second place, that the sea is very wide and whatever means we may have to make the ballot reach the man who is on land wherever he may be, we have not the same means of making these ballots reach the men who are in the navy, and may be at sea where they cannot be reached.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They would be more easily reached than the soldiers.

Mr. DOHERTY: If that is the only difficulty in the way we shall be most happy to extend this provision so as to make it apply to the navy.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Have the Government been in communication with the military authorities of Great Britain as to how far they will be prepared to give facilities for carrying out this Act?

Mr. DOHERTY: No. If there is one thing that never occurred to my mind as a thing concerning which we should consult any outside authority, even the Imperial authorities, it is the question of how far we should extend the Canadian franchise. That is a matter that I think belongs to this Parliament to determine

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We should have to get permission before the soldiers could vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: We are providing that under the law of Canada there shall be a right, and we are providing a method by which that right can be exercised. We have absolute confidence that if the exercise of that right would interfere with the proper performance of the military duties of any Canadian soldier, he would, in the face of the major duty that was incumbent upon him as a soldier, sacrifice the right that we are securing to him. We have no doubt that the Imperial authorities to whom we have handed over our soldiers will see to it that the exercise of this right on the part of our soldiers is not allowed to interfere—even if we concede that there is a danger that our soldiers might allow it to interfere—with the due performance of their military duties. In this country, all of us sometimes find ourselves in situations where the performance of a duty, very much less important than the performance of the military duty of a soldier, makes it impossible for us to vote. But because that may happen, are we going to refuse to provide a method whereby the soldier who, at the time he is called upon to vote, finds himself in a position to exercise that right without interference with the performance of his military duties—are we going to say that that soldier shall not have an opportunity of exercising that right? We are not seeking to impose anything upon the War Office; we are not seeking to interfere with the control of the soldiers that Canada has given into the hands of the War Office. But we are saying that those soldiers are Canadians, and that as they are Canadians they shall have the right to register a vote; and we are taking pains to provide a means for the exercise of that right. How that can be an interference with the control of their military superiors, I must confess I am at a loss to see. Undoubtedly the military authorities will see to it that these men perform their military duties, and undoubtedly not one of our soldiers would for a single moment dream of dropping his military duty, if that were necessary, to avail himself of the opportunity of exercising the right that this Bill seeks to give him. But his right will be recognized. We are simply proproviding means whereby he may exercise that right. But if paramount and superior duties interfere with the exercise of that right, he will be in the unfortunate position of not being able to avail himself of the right that we are recognizing to him; just the same as many of us in this country are sometimes prevented from voting by some duty, although that duty may not be so important as the military duty of a soldier. I am at a loss to see how the idea arises that, in recognizing to this man a right, and providing a method for its exercise, we are in any manner whatever interfering with the military control of the War Office and its officers.

Mr. KNOWLES: Several British subjects in my riding are French reservists, and are now fighting with the armies of France. Will the minister approach the French Government in order to let these men vote?

Mr. DOHERTY: That is a somewhat exceptional case, to which our attention has not been previously called.

Mr. GRAHAM: Quite a lot of French reservists from Montreal are with the French army.

Mr. PROULX: Will the minister give votes to British subjects who are prisoners of war in Germany?

Mr. DOHERTY: We are giving them the right to vote, the same as we are giving that right to every other Canadian soldier. If they are detained by the enemy I am afraid that will prevent their availing themselves of the right to exercise their vote. The hon. gentleman seems to think that if it can be shown that any soldier will not be able to vote under this Act, we should in consequence not let any other soldier vote. It would be just as reasonable if somebody got up and said: We have our General Elections Act, but there may be a man sick in hospital who may be unable to rise from his bed to vote; what are you doing for him?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Arrangements could be made whereby the man in the hospital could vote. The ballots might be sent to the nurses.

Mr. DOHERTY: Does the hon. gentleman propose that that should be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not know, it is a very difficult question.

Mr. DOHERTY: Then he ought to condemn the existing election law.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If it be possible, I am in favour of giving our soldiers the right to vote, but the difficulty is as to the means. Let me ask a question. A soldier who wants to vote conscientiously would want to be informed of the issues, but the ballot that it is proposed to send to him says nothing about the issues. The soldier has to vote for or against the Government, or for an Independent. Does the minister propose any method whereby campaign literature issued by both sides shall be forwarded to the soldiers, so that they may be informed on the questions at issue?

Mr. DOHERTY: The idea of providing for electioneering among the soldiers never occurred to the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister will find several of the officers engaged in electioneering.

Mr. DOHERTY: We were not looking at this matter from the point of view of an electioneering device.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Qui s'excuse s'accuse.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. DOHERTY: The first suggestion of electioneering came from the hon. gentleman himself, and it is not surprising that I should repudiate it at once. He did not give me time to accuse myself, but went forward to suggest the accusation. I was going on to say that if the doctrine is laid down that, unless you can get an arrangement under which every soldier will be able to register his vote, you should not let any soldier vote, then the Bill might as well be dropped. We have an election law in this country under whose enactments large numbers of people who have the right to vote find themselves, by reason of certain circumstances, in a position where they cannot avail themselves of this right, and there will be some soldiers who will not be in a position to exercise this right—the prisoners of war in Germany, for instance.

Mr. TURRIFF: Get the German commanding officers to assist you. That will be just as reasonable as this proposal.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. member was drafting the Bill, perhaps he would think the German commanding officer a suitable person for an election officer; but the majority of us do not think so.

Mr. DEMERS: Has the hon. Minister thought of a different kind of ballot form, than that provided for in Schedule A of this Bill? Because the ballot form provided for in the Bill cannot most certainly meet all the different cases which may happen to occur. Let us imagine for instance a case where there will be three independent candidates.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Might I suggest to my hon. friend and the House generally, that the purpose of the Minister of Justice in rising was to give an explanation of the Bill. The discussion, however, has gone on very much as if we were in committee. When the Bill gets into committee a great many of the questions which relate to the particular provisions of the Bill will be very proper. I would suggest that the inquiries which have been made, and to which no objection has been hitherto taken, might very well be reserved until we get into the committee stage. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice might be permitted to make the explanation for which he was asked by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DOHERTY: As regards the details, when we go into committee, I think hon. members will find that I have a perfectly

open mind and that I am quite prepared to accept any suggestions which will improve the machinery by which the purpose sought to be attained by this Act is carried out. The thing that is important is the purpose in view, and while we suggest this method of doing it, we do it realizing that it no doubt would be possible to improve it and we will be only too anxious to accept any suggestions in that direction.

Mr. PROULX: Does the Minister of Justice know whether the Imperial Parliament is providing any such means to enable the English soldiers to cast their votes? It may be that they will have to hold an election in England before it is necessary to hold one in Canada.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not aware that the Imperial Parliament is legislating upon this subject. As I said a little while ago, in regard to the other matter, I would be disposed to let the Parliament of Canada take the responsibility of determining what is best from the point of view of the exercise of the franchise in Canada, and leave it to the Parliament of the United Kingdom to exercise its own judgment as to what may be a desirable course for itself.

Mr. NESBITT: Has there been any demand from the soldiers for this Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to say, in regard to many of the questions, that while I am very reluctant to interfere, they do not seem to me to be exactly in order at this stage. The second reading of the Bill is simply the stage in which the principle of the Bill is discussed.

Mr. NESBITT: This is the principle, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is asking a question in regard to what is taking place in another part of the world. The principle of the Bill is on the right of the soldiers to vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Surely it is important to consider what is being done in the mother of parliaments?

Mr. SPEAKER: I know, but the asking of questions which would be more appropriate in the committee stage does not seem to me to be exactly in order. I have been reluctant to interfere or to interrupt hon. members in putting these questions. I think hon. gentlemen should remember that we are simply discussing the principle of the Bill and that these details may be considered when the House is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. NESBITT: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if you consider my question out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would regard the question as rather out of order.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: With every disposition to regard as important the suggestion of the right hon. the Prime Minister, may I ask a supplementary question in regard to what I have already said? Would not the minister consider it very unfortunate if a different view should be found to prevail in the mind of Lord Kitchener in regard to the facilities for voting at the front from that which seems to animate this Government? Would not my hon. friend think that it would be an unfortunate contingency should it arise?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not quite grasp the seriousness of the risk. I am not supposing for a moment that Lord Kitchener, or any other British military authority, would want to interfere with the exercise of this right merely because in his opinion Canadian soldiers ought not to vote in Canada.

Mr. CLARK: The military authorities are in absolute control of everything going on at the front.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, they are in absolute control and I was going on to say that I have no doubt that they will so exercise that absolute control as to see that anything that interferes with the soldier's paramount duty does not take place.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is his paramount duty?

Mr. DOHERTY: His paramount duty—

Mr. MACLEAN: It is to fight, is it not?

Mr. DOHERTY: His paramount duty is at the front, and his paramount duty is to bear himself like a man in the great struggle in which he is engaged, but I cannot see that it is inconsistent with the perfect performance of that duty, assuming that the conditions and circumstances permit of it, that he should give some thought to what may be good for Canada here at home and what may be good for her from the point of view of the determination of how she is to be governed. It seems to me that the two things ought to go hand in hand. The same spirit which animates the soldier to his duty in the fighting line should animate the citizen to do his duty in expressing consci-

entiously and honestly what he believes to be best upon the great question of the control of the affairs of his country and the great question of the preservation of her interests all of which are involved in any general election. I cannot see that there is any inconsistency between the performance of these two duties. I have difficulty in quite seizing whence comes the suggestion that in voting there is something that involves a departure from the highest principles and the highest ideals. I put fighting and voting on the same level. They are both of them duties to one's country and I cannot conceive why it should be suggested that there is something derogatory in making it possible for a man to perform both of these duties at the same time. I cannot conceive why it should be suggested that we have to apprehend that Lord Kitchener will intervene to prohibit this and create an unpleasant situation. I have no doubt that Lord Kitchener and the military authorities will see that the opportunity we are giving the soldier to exercise this right is not allowed to interfere with the performance of his paramount duty. It is not our idea that the soldier himself would wish it to be so. We are willing to trust him with this right without fear that, because he has it and we have given him the means of exercising it, he will, for the sake of exercising it, forget the great purpose for which he is where he is. But if the military authorities in one portion of the seat of war, or in another portion, or perhaps throughout the entire front, find that conditions make it necessary that the men should be placed in such a position as they will not be able to avail themselves of this right, I do not see that any unfortunate situation is created or that it will be unfortunate if they cannot, by reason of the call of a higher duty, avail themselves of the opportunity that we are putting before them. What we are doing is this: We are recognizing the right of the soldier to vote; we are endeavouring to prevent him from being called upon to sacrifice that right because he has gone forward to the front, and with all respect, I think there is no body in this world other than this Parliament that has any right to express any opinion upon the question whether that ought to be done or not. Whether it is consistent with the performance of military duty properly under given circumstances that a man should get time or opportunity to vote, is a question for the War Office, and one which I have no doubt it will properly decide; but I cannot for one moment suppose that Lord Kitchener or any other of the British authorities is going to take upon himself to determine merely as an abstract question whether or not we in Canada should so legislate that our Canadian soldiers shall have recognized to them their rights as citizens; and provide a means whereby they may exercise that right.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: To clear up this point and to give the minister an opportunity to clear it up, I may say that I have been told by a man who has been a soldier for years that it would be contrary to military discipline as practised in the British army for a soldier at the front to vote. If that is so, would it not have been wise for the Government to solicit that information before putting Parliament and the country to a political discussion upon the question?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The soldiers in the garrison at Halifax have always voted, provided they had the right to vote.

Mr. CLARK: At the front.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not aware whether there is such a rule as the hon member has suggested, but assuming that there is such a rule, I do not know that that would be a conclusive reason why we should say that a soldier shall have no right to vote, and that we shall provide no means by which he may do so. With all respect, I would think that under such circumstances it might perhaps be for those who made that rule of military discipline to consider whether they had not a duty in the premises, but that is a matter for their consideration. As I said before, it is for us to determine who shall have the franchise in this country, and to provide a method for those who should have it whereby, in conformity with the law of this country, they may exercise that right. If they be subject to other duties of military discipline which prevent their exercising that right, we at all events have done our part; the people of Canada have shown to the men who have gone forward to the front to fight for them that, so far as it depends upon the people of Canada speaking through their parliamentary representatives, every right which those men might otherwise have shall be guaranteed to them, and that in so far as the people of Canada can furnish them a means to exercise that right, they shall have that means. The responsibility for the rules of military discipline will rest

with those who make them, and we do not undertake to over-ride them. We have done our full duty when we provide under our law for the recognition and protection of the soldier's rights as a citizen, when we make it clear to him that we do not force him to add to all his other sacrifices the sacrifice of his right of franchise as a citizen. What may be the proper rule of discipline is for the military authorities to determine, and whether that rule of discipline should interfere with the exercise of the right of the soldier as a citizen, must of course, by force of circumstances and in the nature of things, be determined by the military authorities.

At one o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. DOHERTY: Before the House rose I had endeavoured to set forth the principle of the measure and to give its outlines. I was led quite willingly into more detail than was strictly necessary by questions which I am very happy to answer. I would like to point out that the idea of soldiers on active service voting in an election, or a method being provided whereby persons who are not able, as soldiers are not able, to be in their own electoral districts at the time of polling, may be enabled to vote, is not new. They are both new, I think, in this country; but as long ago as the Civil War in the United States, we saw the right to the franchise of the soldier in the field recognized and an effective method provided whereby he could exercise that franchise. It is quite true that the circumstances were not identical with those surrounding our soldiers to-day, but it is also true that those circumstances offered greater difficulties to the exercise of the franchise than our own soldiers would labour under so long as they remain within Canada. In the course of the American Civil War no less than thirteen states of the Union provided a system whereby the soldiers in the field were enabled to vote, and under these provisions 150,000 votes were cast in the election of 1864. The method by which these votes were taken differs from that which this Bill proposes to provide. It was possible there to provide differently, because the conditions were different. An arrangement was made whereby the different units chose election officers, and these election officers held the polls and took the ballots in the ordinary way and these ballots were forwarded. In some of the states provision was made that a soldier was entitled to register his vote in any electoral district in which he had resided for a period of ten days anterior to his enlistment. As the House is aware, the elections in the United States, even for the presidency or other federal office, are under the laws of the different states, each of these states electing a certain number of men to represent it in the Electoral College. As between states provisions differ in detail, but, generally, the vote was taken in the way I have indicated, and these votes were gathered by commissioners or electoral officers. These electoral officers or commissioners, as is provided here, wrote certificates on the back of the ballots, and the ballots were then sent to the judge of the electoral district in which the vote was to be cast, and it was then cast and counted practically in the manner which the Bill suggests the votes of our soldiers should be cast and counted. There was also provision, as in our Bill, for qualified electors establishing their qualification by means of affidavit. Many of the states of the Union have provision whereby persons absent for other reasons than the fact that they may be engaged in military service are enabled to vote. One of the states makes this provision with regard to soldiers in particular as a permanent law, but other states provide means by which any absentee can record his vote. I need not go into the matter further than to say that these measures do not differ, I believe, materially, from the system we propose. Provision is made for the enclosure of the ballot in the envelope and for its being forwarded; and, of course, where it is essential, in order to vote, that a person should be registered upon the list, provision is made for the establishment of the fact that he is so registered. In Australia, there is provision for a vote by absentees, and similar provision is made in New Zealand, Queensland, Victoria, and Tasmania. I may refer especially to the Tasmania law, where the machinery for the transmission of the vote is almost identical with that suggested here. Of course, it does not involve the intervention of military officers, because it is a law of general application under whose operation all persons who are absent from their electoral districts may exercise their franchise.

That vote is taken before such officers very much in the same way as we propose that the votes of our soldiers shall be taken; it

is forwarded by mail to a general commissioner who receives and distributes those votes to the officer who fulfils the duties which are performed in this country by the returning officer. So far as I am aware, no evil effects have resulted from this kind of voting in any of these countries. I have been assured on what I believe to be reliable authority that in Tasmania the system has been found to work very satisfactorily. Even in England the idea is not absolutely new. I am not in a position to say that any law providing the means for such voting has been adopted, but in 1901 a Bill was introduced in the English House of Commons by Mr. McDonough and some eight other members, including Sir Christopher Furness, the purpose of which was to enable officers and seamen of the Royal and mercantile navies and fishermen to vote when absent. True, the Bill did not become law, but the principle of the Bill was adopted, and the second reading was carried by a vote of 150 to 47. So far as I have been able to see, for no reason other than the pressure of business then before the Imperial Parliament, the Bill failed to go through. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House think we are very daring when we venture to do anything which the United Kingdom has not done. Here we have the fact that the House of Commons of the United Kingdom in 1901 endorsed the principle of providing a method of voting for certain persons prevented, by what were considered to be sufficient reasons, from being present in their electoral districts to deposit their votes. Further than that, in connection with the present war, New Zealand passed a law for the precise purpose of enabling soldiers who had left the country to exercise their franchise in the election which at the time of the passing of the law was approaching, and which has since taken place. Under that law, soldiers absent from New Zealand were enabled to vote in the presence of officers specially appointed to act outside of New Zealand, and who were described as electoral commissioners. That vote was recorded upon a voting paper practically identical with the ballot form proposed by this Bill, and was forwarded to the chief electoral officer at the capital, as we propose to have the votes forwarded. They were transmitted by him to the different returning officers, opened in a manner very similar to that which we propose, and duly counted. That legislation was enacted specially for soldiers who had left New Zealand. With regard to details beyond what I have given, that Act left to the Governor in Council to settle by regulations the manner in which effect should be given to the Act. We have endeavoured to include in our Bill all the provisions governing the method of voting. It seems to those of us who do commend this Bill that it is more desirable that Parliament itself should fix the method of voting than that it should be left in the hands of the Government of the day.

Mr. MURPHY: Owing to my attendance at another committee. I was unable to attend all the meetings of the committee over which my hon. friend presided, but at the last meeting of that committee I raised a question as to this Bill alleged to have been passed by the Parliament of New Zealand, and also as to an election alleged to have been held after the passing of the Bill, in which the voting of soldiers is alleged to have taken place under the provisions of that Act. My hon. friend will recall that the committee asked its clerk to cable New Zealand and obtain particulars both as to the Bill and as to the alleged election. If these particulars have been obtained, I should be grateful to my hon. friend if he would give them to the committee.

Mr. DOHERTY: I was just about to add that the Bill had been acted upon. As the hon. member points out, the committee did suggest that a cablegram be sent to New Zealand inquiring as to the actual operation of the Act, and such cablegram was sent. The message was sent by the parliamentary counsel, through the clerk of this House. It was dated March 27, 1915, addressed to the Prime Minister of New Zealand and reads as follows:

> Was proposed Bill giving absent soldiers vote passed? Was vote taken? If yes, how many votes were cast? Please cable answer.

The answer received from the Prime Minister of New Zealand was as follows:

> In reply cable 28 your clerk House of Commons. Bill referred to passed and votes of all soldiers who left before general election recorded. Total votes, 10,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Were the votes of the soldiers taken before they left New Zealand?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, this Bill applied only to the soldiers who had left New Zealand. The law in New Zealand to which I refer, and which is referred to in these messages, was passed exclusively for the

purpose of enabling soldiers who had left New Zealand to record their votes. Section 2 of that Act is:

> Every member of any expeditionary force sent from New Zealand to serve in the war in which His Majesty is at present engaged, shall be entitled to vote in the manner hereinafter prescribed.

Then, in dealing with the appointment of electoral officers this point is further made clear:

> Electoral officers may be appointed out of New Zealand for the purpose of enabling any person to record his vote under this Act who is a member of any expeditionary force sent out of New Zealand before the passing of this Act.

The soldiers who had not left New Zealand could vote under the general law providing for absentee voting.

Mr. MURPHY: Is the minister able to state where the soldiers cast their votes?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not that information, but wherever they were, they were outside of New Zealand, and wherever they were, they would have been entitled to vote under that Act. As long ago as 1864 provision was made in the neighbouring republic to enable soldiers in the field to vote. The Government and the Congress of the United States in that day did not fear that a soldier would fight less well because he also voted in the elections upon which the fate of his country might depend just as fully as on the result of a war. We have the further fact that in all the different states of the Union, and the different dominions of this Empire that I have mentioned, a system for the registering of the votes of people who were absent from their own electoral district has been in force and in operation, and, as I am informed, has given rise to no ground for complaint. We are after all not in the face of any very novel proposition. Large and important parts of the world, where the ballot is looked upon as of as great sacredness and of as great importance as we look upon it, have found it possible to devise a method by which to get an honest and a safe vote of persons who were not actually at home. Some of these countries have gone so far as to extend the advantages of such a method to people who were absent on their own private and personal business only, and I am not prepared to say that they did not do properly. But I do ask the House, should we hesitate to take the risk in respect to our soldiers that they have been willing to take in the interest of persons whose absence was attributable only to their attention to their proper affairs. Should we not take the risk when it is a question of endeavouring to protect in the exercise of their right of franchise men who are absent from their homes and their country, for Canada's affairs, for the affairs of this Empire, and when their absence involves the risking of their very lives. New Zealand has solved the problem under practically the identical circumstances in which we are confronted with it. I may say that it is not the first time that New Zealand has set a good example to the other countries of the world, and I fancy we would make no mistake in following her lead.

I think I have said all that I can say with usefulness or advantage in moving the second reading of this Bill and commending it to the House for adoption. Some query has been made as to the strength of my commendation. As I said in answer to that question the House must judge as to the strength with which I have presented it. For my own part I pretend to nothing more than to commend it with all earnestness and all sincerity. I believe that it is impossible to justify the questioning of the soundness of the principle. I have seen a good deal of criticism of it, but it has seemed to me that the criticism rested upon the assumption that everything that surrounded the exercise of the franchise necessarily involved ignoble and unworthy dispute and strife. I cannot recognize the truth of that proposition. I cannot for one moment conceive that you are going to throw disorder and disunion into the ranks of our troops because you merely afford to each man, at his own option and in the exercise of his own liberty, an opportunity of recording his voice upon the question of how his country ought to be governed. I commend this Bill with all the sincerity and all the earnestness of which I am capable. I shall certainly be very glad of any suggestions that may serve to make it more workable, and to make it more effectually and safely attain the purpose in view. I commend it personally in no partisan spirit, and I have every confidence that it will be received and dealt with in no partisan spirit. I am satisfied that we ought to be able to all get together in a common endeavour to give to the men who are carrying to-day Canada's honour in their hands—the men who have possibly put many of us who are at home and will have every facility to vote, to the blush when we compare our conduct with theirs—the opportunity which Canada

extends practically to all her sons, to have each his say, and to make his voice heard in the determination of the great issues upon which the future of Canada depends. To my mind everything that tends to facilitate the exercise of his franchise by every man entitled to vote, ought to be encouraged. There is no doubt that, looking at this from the point of view of the right of the soldier, the question is one of very great importance, and I do not think we need look further than to the fact that it is intended to afford him protection in the exercise of his rights, to find ample justification for making an effort to enable him to exercise that right. But over and above the rights of the soldier, or of any individual, is Canada's right to have her people vote. The country has the right to see that every honest man within her boundaries should give to her the advantage of his advice and his opinion as to the manner in which her affairs should be governed and directed. We count that 50,000 of Canada's sons will be absent from us before this war is over. We are ready to look forward to the possibility of twice 50,000 men being absent from our borders before this war is over. Is it fair to ask Canada to lose the advantage of having those 50,000 or 100,000, or other thousands that may be added to that number, cast their vote and give their views as to what is best for her? Is it not presumable that these thousands of men are among the best that Canada has to give, and shall we lightly sacrifice the advantage to Canada of their participation in decisions that may be as fraught with importance to her future as anything that possibly is involved in this war? I say from the point of view of this country that we should strain every nerve to secure to her the advantage of the participation in any election that may take place of these, her noblest and her best sons.

In conclusion, I simply want again to say that I ask ultimately the acceptance of this measure, and that as to the details, they ought to be given the best consideration of which we are capable. I am satisfied that there are hon. gentlemen in this House who can suggest methods of working this plan out that will be an improvement on those that the members of the committee who do commend the Bill have been able to find. I would in a very special manner welcome the aid and co-operation of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), who said this morning that with the principle of the Bill he was quite in agreement. I know no man in this House who can give more valuable aid towards the solution of such difficulties as the giving effect to the important principle involves, than that very hon. gentleman. This morning it seemed to me that there was on the part of some members a disposition to laugh at this measure. I would be sorry to suppose that that disposition, if it did exist, would persist. I should not like to make any reference to the class of people of whom it has been said: They came to laugh but remained to pray. Still less would I flatter myself that any words of mine could influence the state of mind of any hon. gentleman. But I have absolute confidence that if hon. gentlemen of this House will give serious thought to the principle involved, they will realize that the matter is a serious one, and that it calls for our most earnest consideration. I have confidence that if this House gives to this Bill the serious consideration that it deserves, the Bill, whether it be perfect now or not, will leave this House a fairly perfect measure. I do not question that there are difficulties in the way of providing a suitable method, but I believe we have found a solution. I do not question that there may be a better solution. I recognized at the very outset that there were difficulties in the way, but I was surprised to see that because I had said there were difficulties, some people inferred that it was impossible to find a solution. When it is a question of doing a thing that ought to be done, difficulties only exist in order that they may be overcome, and I am satisfied that with the earnest co-operation of the members of this House, without distinction of party, we shall triumphantly overcome the obstacles that stand in the way of the realization of the proposal of this Bill; and that the Parliament of Canada shall not separate until it has seen to it that should occasion arise our soldiers shall have their right to their vote protected, and Canada shall have the assurance of the benefit of their participation in any election that may take place.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has expressed the hope that all those who had anything to do with this measure would approach it in a spirit of candour. Speaking for myself, I will say very candidly—and I hope my hon. friend will believe me, for I am speaking as sincerely as he has spoken—that I shall approach this measure in no other spirit than that which he has prayed for. There is no one in this House, I am sure, who would be disposed to question this measure,

if the object of it could be attained consistently with the spirit and letter of our constitution. But I have to observe at once to my hon. friend that this measure is, I will not say revolutionary, but certainly very much more extensive than any we have to-day upon the statute book. This proposed legislation creates a new franchise. I am fairly familiar, though perhaps not so familiar as he, with the legislation of 1864 in the United States during the Civil War. I am aware that on that occasion several of the States of the Union passed laws to allow their soldiers in the field to cast their votes at the presidential election. I think I am correct in stating, however, that on no such occasion did any of those States create a new franchise. They simply provided that those who were electors in the States should be enabled to cast their votes in the field. But my hon. friend knows that the very first disposition of the Bill which he has brought down for our consideration is the creation of a franchise which does not exist to-day. My hon. friend gave the very inspiration of this legislation when, in the course of his observations, he stated that one who is good enough to take a share in the fight which is now going on, not only for the Empire, but for the whole of civilization, is good enough to take a share in the administration of this country. Let me observe at once that while these are glittering words they are, after all, nothing but words. They do not stand analysis, and the falsity of that phrasing of words is shown by the very first line of the first disposition of this Bill:

> Every male British subject of twenty-one years of age or upwards serving in the military forces of Canada in the present war. . . who, when he was appointed to or enlisted or enrolled in such forces, . . . shall be entitled to vote.

My hon. friend stated that any man who takes a share in this fight ought to be allowed to cast a vote in the impending election, and to be given a share in the administration of the country, but my hon. friend is aware—the statement has been made on the floor of this House—that there are within the Canadian forces hundreds, nay, perhaps thousands, of Americans who crossed over to this country for the purpose of enlisting and who are to-day taking a share in the fight. It is a matter of history that when the war broke out in August last, thousands of Americans who were in Paris, impelled by the sacredness of the cause for which France was fighting, at once gave up their life of luxury and took up the life of the soldier; and to-day these men are in the trenches doing their share in the fight for France, for England, for civilization. According to the dictum of the Minister of Justice, it is not only those who are British subjects who are entitled to take a share in the administration of this country, but all of our soldiers who are in the fight. If you maintain this principle, then, by a parity of reasoning, these Americans should also be given a share in the administration of the country. But no one would think of that, because it is inconsistent with responsible government as we understand it that those who are not subjects of the Realm should have the franchise, and so that class has to be eliminated. Again, hundreds of our fellow citizens, boys of our own flesh and blood of 16 or 17 or 18 years of age, have cast aside their prospects in life and risked everything in order to take a share in the fight which is going on. These young men did not wait until they were 21 years of age. My hon. friend does not contemplate giving them the right of suffrage, because the law is universal that the right of suffrage shall not be entrusted to those who are not of age. Therefore, it is not a truism to say, as was said by my hon. friend this morning, that he who is good enough to share in the fight is good enough to share in the administration of this country. We have laws and regulations, the result of the wisdom and experience of ages, which have determined that we may expect the blood and the sacrifice of the soldier, and yet that the soldier is not entitled to cast a vote in the administration of the country. That is so in this country; it is so in Great Britain; it is so in the United States. There are uniform laws governing the exercise of civil and political rights which no nation has yet contravened.

The first blemish I find in the measure of my hon. friend is that it creates a new franchise. If my hon. friend had been content with proposing a measure which would enable the soldier who is an elector to give his vote, it would have been less objectionable than this measure is. Sir, I need not recall to you the fact that in this country we have no Dominion franchise; we take the franchises of the provinces, but to-day we are creating a Dominion franchise for a certain purpose. The very example which my hon. friend has given of the American legislation of 1864, does not prove his case,

but is rather against it, because the law of 1864 was not passed by Congress. The several states of the Union which had the right to legislate with reference to the franchise passed the laws, and if such a law is to be passed in this country, it ought to be left to the provinces which have the right to legislate with reference to the franchise.

Mr. DOHERTY: Does the right hon. gentleman contend that Congress had any constitutional power whatever to pass such a law? We have.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No doubt we have the power; the only question is whether we should exercise the power. It is not a question of power. I grant that we have the power to a certain extent, but I will show later on that we have no power to pass such a law as this. We have the power to pass a law which confers the franchise. We can discard to-morrow the provincial franchises upon which our elections have been carried on from 1867 to 1882 and from 1900 to the present day. But my hon. friend adds to the franchises of the provinces a new franchise especially for one class of His Majesty's subjects. The object of the Bill is to give to soldiers who are not in the country the right to vote. My hon. friend know as well as I do that there is in this country, and there will always be, a certain class of subjects who cannot exercise the franchise on election day. It was only a few days ago, when we were discussing a Bill—I think it was one of the electoral Bills—that the statement was made on one side and not contradicted on the other, that railway men—conductors, firemen and men of that class—cannot on election day cast their votes. The trains of the country must go on; certain duties have to be performed and the man who has to perform these duties cannot vote. Is there any difference in this respect between the railway man and the soldier? The railway man is not alone. The sailor, the fisherman, and the lumberman are very often not able to cast their votes. Within my own remembrance we have had three elections in winter time—in 1874, 1887 and 1891—and those whose memories go back to those days must recall that in many a constituency men who were voters could not register their votes because they were away in the bush doing their work as lumbermen. Between the soldier, the lumberman, the fisherman, the farmer and any other class, there is no difference whatever in this respect; all are subject to the same laws and all are equal before the law. We all certainly are proud of the soldier. But the soldier, in our economy, is no more entitled to favour than any other class of the community. The man who digs in the trenches of a railway is just as much entitled to favour as the man who digs in the trenches in France. The man who farms, who fishes, or who lumbers has just as much right to his vote as the soldier. But we make a special provision for the soldier. What do we give him? We recognize the duties which he performs for the country, we recognize the sacrifices which he makes, we recognize the dangers to which he is exposed and, therefore, if he is disabled, we provide to keep him for the rest of his days, and if he loses his life we provide for those who are dependent upon him. But when it comes to the matter of the franchise, all subjects of the King are on a footing of absolute equality.

There are in the Bill of my hon. friend provisions for the soldier who is at home and provisions for the soldier who is out of the country fighting in Europe. As to the soldier who is at home, there can be no necessity for any law. If he is in the country he can easily be allowed to vote where he is registered, and the military authorities would certainly give him leave to go wherever he had to go to record his vote. Therefore the measure applies only to the man who is serving out of the country—the man who has enlisted, and is no longer in Canada, but is in Bermuda or in Europe. This man is no longer under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Parliament. Every one of the 50,000 men who have left the country, or who will leave the country, is no longer under the control and jurisdiction of this Parliament; he is a part of the British Army; he is under the control of British authority; he is under the jurisdiction of the War Office, and the War Office alone has the right to pass legislation for him or against him. My hon. friend gives power under such circumstances, but to whom does he give the power? Who is to exercise the authority? My hon. friend is trying by an Act of this Parliament to impose a duty upon the officers of the British army. Let me say to my hon. friend at once that every line of his Bill, even after it has been sanctioned by the Senate, even after it has been assented to by His Royal Highness the Governor General, is so much waste paper. This Parliament has no right to pass any legislation to impose any duty upon the officers of the British army, and

my hon. friend has to some extent recognized this.

Before I proceed further let me go back to another radical disposition of this Bill by which the man who is going to vote is not going to vote as any man in Canada is going to vote: he is not going to vote for a candidate, he is not going to vote for a man, but he is going to vote for a party. This is the first time in British legislation, as far as my poor knowledge goes, that we have ever seen such a provision of law. We live under party government, but up to this time we have never carried party so far as to make it the object of an election. This is the first time, I repeat, as far as my information goes, and I believe that my information is absolutely accurate, that a voter in a British country will have been called upon to express his opinion, not upon a candidate but upon a party. Is that in accordance with the principle of British legislation? Although we believe in party, we respect the intelligence of the voter so much that we allow him to exercise his free judgment in voting upon the candidate rather than upon the party. It is impossible to separate the party from the candidate and the candidate from the party; and in every election there are men who belong to one party who refuse to cast their vote in favour of the candidate of that party, because they are not in sympathy with him. I will give a case in point. In the election of 1911, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister carried the city of Halifax, but a political opponent was elected at the same time with him. There was a dual contest: two candidates on each side and two to be elected, but it was not the ticket of one party or the ticket of the other that was elected, because while my right hon. friend the Prime Minister was at the head of the poll, his chief political opponent was next to him. What conclusion are we to draw from that? That a large proportion of the Conservative electorate did not believe in the other candidate and preferred to give their votes to the candidate of the other party. But why does my hon. friend not allow the ordinary machinery to be used, and why does he not permit the soldier at the front to vote for the candidate? The answer is that it is impossible to do so. For my part, I am not willing to create a new franchise, because I think that is absolutely wrong; but I am quite willing that the soldier who is a voter to-day should be allowed to vote if it is possible to provide means to enable him to vote. As I said before, however—and I come back to this idea—the whole Bill is radically wrong in this, that you are trying to exercise legislative authority over those over whom you have no authority at all.

There is a curious provision in the Bill as to those who are to be the registering officers. The ballots are to be sent to the Secretary of the High Commissioner in London and he is to send them—where? This is where the impossibility of the thing is disclosed. Let me call the attention of my hon. friend to section 3, subsection 2:

> If the corps is in Europe, the clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall notify by telegraph cable the secretary of the High Commissioner for Canada of the issuing of the writ, and the secretary shall thereupon send a sufficient number of ballot papers, affidavits and envelopes to the proper officer or officers, and such officer or officers shall give each volunteer entitled to vote a ballot paper, affidavit and envelope.

Where do you find any definition in this Bill as to who is to be the proper officer or officers? There are now over 30,000 of our soldiers in Europe, who are part of the British army, and the units which existed when they left Canada are no longer the units in Great Britain or France. Those 30,000 men may be found in 30 different regiments, in 300 different companies. Who, therefore, is the proper officer or officers to become the returning officer?

The difficulty is so great that my hon. friend has not tried to solve it; he has left this vague disposition in the Bill. When you have a permanent organization which is running its ordinary course every day, you can refer certain duties to the proper officers; but this is not a permanent organization. It is not even a temporary organization; it is no organization at all; it has to be made for the occasion, and there is no disposition in this Bill to say where the ballots are to go. How can the Secretary of the High Commissioner, who is entrusted with the duty, know where the ballots are to go, and how will he be informed as to where the 30,000 or 50,000 men are? He does not know unless he can know by the grace of the War Office, and he does not know to whom he should address the envelopes and documents mentioned in this subsection. Is the proper officer to be the general of the division or the colonel of the regiment or the captain of the company? Who is to have authority over there? The weak point in the Bill, to which my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) referred when he questioned the minister

4 p.m.

upon it, is that you are imposing upon 20 or 30 or 40 officers of the British army duties in regard to which they have received no information and as to which they know nothing at all. This consideration, it seems to me, should show very forcibly to my hon. friend that, apart from the fact that we have no authority to give any instructions to officers of the British army, it is impossible to say where and how this Bill is to be carried out if it becomes law.

All the points in this Bill are more or less technical, but I come now to a consideration which is very practical and as to which the minister, when he was questioned, did not in my opinion give any satisfactory answer. Elections are elections, whether they are at the front or elsewhere. They mean passion in the voter and in those who are inspiring the voter. The right of election presupposes the right of selection; and, if you give to the soldiers who are now at the front the right to vote, you also thereby give to the Government or to the Opposition the right to canvass. You cannot expect that the soldiers are going to perform their duty as electors unless they are instructed upon the issues. There is in this country not only the broad issue of the war—the issue of the war is of course the supreme issue—but many other considerations which will and must influence the judgment of the electors, and the soldier has a right to be instructed upon them. If you give to the soldier who is today in the trenches the right to vote, you sanction also the possibility of canvassing him; you sanction also the introduction into the army of the canvasser. I do not know how canvassers would be received in the British army; but there is another more insidious means of canvassing which is possible: you can canvass by mail, and who knows that the trenches will not be flooded with the kind of literature of which I gave the House a sample this morning? This is not a vain idea on my part, because this literature is issued by a great party, and it can go wherever there is a vote to be reached; and according to this Bill, if it becomes law, there is a vote to be reached in the trenches of France as there is in this country.

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

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

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate.

And having returned,

Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Honour the Deputy of his Royal Highness the Governor General had been pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act to amend the Canadian Patriotic Fund Act, 1914.

An Act to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

An Act respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Athabaska and Grand Prairie Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Brantford and Hamilton Electric Railway Company.

An Act respecting the British Columbia and White River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.

An Act respecting the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Independent Order of Foresters Consolidated Act.

An Act respecting the Title and Trust Company, and to change its name to Chartered Trust and Executor Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Preferred Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the Vancouver Life Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate Marcil Trust Company.

An Act respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.

An Act respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Toronto Eastern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Brulé, Grand Prairie and Peace River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.

An Act respecting Pacific, Peace River and Athabaska Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.

An Act respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company, and to change its name

to "The Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation."

An Act respecting the Casualty Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the Bank of Alberta.

An Act to incorporate Colonial Bank (Canada).

An Act to incorporate Alberta Permanent Trust Company.

An Act respecting the Western Dominion Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Western Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.

An Act respecting the Toronto Terminals Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate Entwistle and Alberta Southern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate Fraser Valley Terminal Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

An Act respecting certain patents of the Lohmann Company.

An Act respecting the Sterling Life Assurance Company of Canada.

An Act to amend the Bank Act.

An Act respecting the Van Buren Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate Northern Pacific and British Columbia Railway Company.

An Act for the relief of William Ewart New.

An Act for the relief of Helene Suzette Baxter Douglas.

An Act respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.

An Act respecting the patent of the National Wood Distilling Company.

An Act for the relief of Lottie Thorndike.

An Act respecting the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.

An Act for the relief of Adam Clarke Anderson.

An Act for the relief of Alexander McIntyre.

An Act for the relief of Violet Burnett Delmege.

An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1907.

An Act for the relief of Arthur Ernest Birdsell.

An Act for the relief of Thomas Jefferson Moore.

An Act for the relief of Alice Beckett.

An Act for the relief of Austin McPhail Bothwell.

An Act for the relief of Agnès Gravelle.

An Act for the relief of Clara Elizabeth Darnell.

An Act for the relief of Thomas Batin Harries.

An Act for the relief of William John Owen Delaney.

An Act for the relief of Edith May Webster Boydell.

An Act for the relief of William Robert Delaney.

An Act respecting the Premier Trust Company.

An Act respecting the North West Life Assurance Company.

An Act respecting the Moncton and Northumberland Strait Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Judges Act.

An Act to supplement the Revenue required to meet War Expenditures.

An Act to authorize certain extensions of time to Insurance Companies.

An Act respecting certain issues of Dominion Notes.

SOLDIERS' VOTING BILL.

The House resumed, consideration of the motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice) for the second reading of Bill, No. 111, to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (resuming): It would be a mere truism for me to remind hon. gentlemen that the exercise of the franchise has always been surrounded with safeguards, not only to secure a correct expression of the opinion of the electors, but also to insure the due performance of their duties by the election officers and to establish a measure of absolute fair play between party and party. Our system of Government is a complicated one, but the supreme end that we should have in view is that there should be an honest expression of the opinions of the electorate, and that the will of the people should prevail. I do not means to say that the will of the people is always on the right side; but we must take the bad with the good. Though wrong may sometimes triumph; after all, the best system of Government that has yet been devised is that under which we live. The blemish, the fatal blemish, it seems to me, in the measure of my hon. friend is that it does not provide any of the safeguards which exist in this country when the people are called upon to give their verdict upon public questions, and which assure a correct expression of the will of the electors. There are in this Bill no such safeguards; and, if such safeguards are not provided, it is not because my hon. friend has been oblivious to the need of them. I am sure that he must have given more than one anxious hour to the consideration of this matter, and he must have found that it was not possible to provide for registering the votes in the trenches with the same attention and security as prevail in this country. If the Bill is silent upon this point, if it is a dead letter so far as this is concerned, it is only because it is not possible for the hon. gentleman to find safeguards which

would afford a satisfactory solution of his problem.

What safeguards can we have? I need not enlarge upon the formalities which are required in our elections to provide that we shall have a minimum of fraud. Our law goes far to prevent fraud and to get an honest expression of public opinion. For instance, the law provides that scrutineers may be present, and very few frauds can be committed when they are present. The returning officer may be a partisan; in fact, returning officers have been accused more than once in this House of being partisans. There may be partisanship even at the front. It is well known to us all that in the heat of elections men who are in ordinary affairs honest and respectable citizens will take liberties with the law which they would never take in the prosecution of their own private business. The passion for party, the passion to win, makes men more or less callous upon such occasions. Is there anything which can justify my hon. friend in supposing that the same passions which rule on our side of the Atlantic will be powerless on the other side? Is there reason to believe that the instinct which moves a man on this side of the Atlantic to do the best he can, and even to go beyond the law, to obtain a triumph for the cause in which he believes, will not make its influence felt because the elections will be held under khaki instead of under worsted?

The only safeguard of which the Minister of Justice spoke this morning is that he trusts to the honour of the British officer. Sir, no man goes farther in his confidence in the British officer than I do. Everybody knows that nowhere in the world is honour more supreme than in the ranks of the British army, especially among the officers. But, Sir, the British army is composed of men like other men, and even among them it is possible to find men who are not quite infallible. It will not do for us to believe that they are of different flesh from ourselves. Their education may be better than ours and their accent more refined, but after all they are of the human race, and we must presume that human frailty affects them as it affects others. So we must assume that there will be offences. What provisions are made in respect to this matter? Let us see how the Bill provides that the vote is to be taken:

> The volunteer may thereupon make the affidavit in form B before any commissioned officer in the Canadian military forces, and, after making the affidavit, mark the ballot paper as a vote for the Government or the Opposition or for the independent candidate, in the presence of the said commissioned officer, but in such a manner as not to disclose to the officer how he is voting, and shall fold the ballot paper so that it cannot be read and shall then place the same, together with the affidavit, in an envelope upon the back of which shall be endorsed a certificate in form C.

Then that is to be transmitted to the returning officer. These are all the precautions taken, and they are no precautions at all. I submit to the consideration of the hon. minister himself that, taking the vote in this way, there and then you open a wide door for violation of the law and for fraud against the electors. Who is going to insure that the vote of the elector which is put in the envelope shall be the vote that comes to the returning officer? Who is going to insure that the envelope shall not be tampered with—that the vote shall not be tampered with? Such things have been known before. The law guards against such things now, but there is no such safeguard in the Bill. Let this Bill become law, and, I repeat, it opens the door wide for fraud and violation of the law.

My hon. friend suggests that we must trust the honour of the British officers; but he himself does not altogether trust the honour of the British officers, because, foreseeing a violation of the law, he has imposed penalties upon wrong doers. I direct attention to section 9 of the Bill:

> 9. Any person who wilfully and without lawful excuse:
>
> (a) causes any delay in the transmission or delivery to the returning officer of any envelope with the certificate endorsed in accordance with the provisions of this Act, or
>
> (b) opens any such envelope, or
>
> (c) shall attempt to obtain or communicate any information as to the party or person for whom any vote is given in any particular ballot paper used under the provisions of this Act, or
>
> (d) prevents or endeavours to prevent any volunteer entitled to vote hereunder from voting, or
>
> (e) makes any untrue statement as to his name or corps for insertion in a certificate, or
>
> (f) signs a certificate containing any untrue statement, shall be liable upon summary conviction to a fine not exceeding two hundred dollars and costs, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or to both fine and imprisonment.

The hon. gentleman who fathers this Bill has foreseen that offences of this kind might be committed under the operation of this proposed legislation, and, by providing for a violation of the law, he gives answer to his own assertion that he would trust the honour of the British officers. What is the worth of this enactment of penalties? How

will the commission of such offences as are contemplated be prevented? My hon. friend knows that these penalties cannot be enforced. The offenders cannot be tried in this country, and in all probability they would not be tried in Great Britain. They will be tried, perhaps, in France, perhaps in Belgium, perhaps in Germany, because it is possible that when elections take place our troops may be in Germany. This provision with regard to penalties is there only for show; it is not there to serve its professed purpose.

There is another objection to which the attention of my hon. friend was called this morning, and to which I think he did not give a satisfactory answer. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) asked my hon. friend whether the Government had communicated with the War Office with regard to this measure. What was my hon. friend's answer? He said that the Government had not communicated with the War Office; he presumed that it would be a matter of indifference to Lord Kitchener whether the Canadian soldiers were or were not allowed to vote, or what were the issues between the Government and the Opposition in this country. It is true that to Lord Kitchener and the War Office it would be a matter of indifference as to what the issues were between the Government and the Opposition in Canada, but what is not a matter of indifference to Lord Kitchener and to the War Office is the discipline of the army over which Lord Kitchener presides. Does my hon. friend suggest that it is a matter of indifference to the army that one section of it should be allowed to vote on a certain question, and that the rest of the army should not be allowed to vote? Is it a matter of indifference to the War Office and to the British authorities that such an example should be set in the army? If the Canadian soldier were allowed to vote, would the commander of the army be indifferent to the spirit manifested in the portion of the army which was not allowed to vote. That is a democratic age, and while I am a strong democrat, nevertheless, I think, that democracy must be subject to the law. The principle of manhood suffrage is far more extended in this country than it is in many other countries, perhaps more so even than in Great Britain, and if this proposed Bill becomes law there will be introduced into the army a new spirit which has not yet been found to be consistent with public opinion in Great Britain. This is a very important consideration, and it is one in regard to which, I venture to say, the commander of the army may have an opinion to express. Certainly it was the first duty of the Government, when they contemplated such legislation as this, to confer with the British authorities and to ascertain whether or not they would sanction it.

But the matter of discipline is not the only consideration. How would the operation of such a law affect the movements of the army? Spring is advancing, and we have reason to believe that as spring advances the allied armies will pounce upon the German army and drive it from France and Belgium to the Rhine, and from the Rhine to the very heart of Germany. We know too well that this cannot be accomplished in a day, in a month, or perhaps in one season. Battles are imminent, and in these modern times battles are not fought in one day or two days or three days, as they were in the time of Napoleon; under modern conditions battles last for weeks. Yet it is proposed that the Secretary of the High Commissioner shall send his ballots and his envelopes to the commanders or officers in charge, in order to obtain the votes of the Canadian soldiers. It is possible that this might be done when an important movement of the army would be taking place. Perhaps the Canadian forces would be engaged in battle, and one section of the army would have a vote and the other would not. This is not a vague supposition; it is a supposition which is quite within the bounds of possibility, and it is in respect to this that the Government would have been wise if they had consulted the British War Office before thrusting upon them the responsibility which will be imposed upon them if this Bill becomes law. Looking upon this measure dispassionately and without prejudice; looking upon it from the standpoint of duty not only to ourselves, but to the great cause in which we are engaged, we must come to the conclusion that it is ill-conceived in its principle, ill-conceived in its practice, and, still more, ill-conceived in its dispositions.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am somewhat surprised at the tone of the right hon. gentleman's remarks, because, when this matter was first broached in the House, I heard, if I am not mistaken, a strong expression of opinion from his chief lieutenant in favour of the principle of the resolution placed on the Order Paper by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp): that the men serving abroad in the expeditionary forces of Canada ought not to be denied

the right and opportunity to vote. The right hon. gentleman has taken very strong ground against the measure. I did not underestimate the difficulties of working out a proposal which on the one hand would provide proper safeguards and on the other hand would not deny to the soldier the right which he would have possessed if he had remained in Canada; and therefore I moved that the resolution which had been placed upon the Order Paper by the hon. member for Ottawa should be referred to a committee then engaged in the work of considering amendments to the Controverted Elections Act. They have since had this subject under consideration and have made the report to the House which is embodied in this Bill.

I take very strongly the ground that men who are risking their lives in order that the liberties and institutions of this land shall be preserved ought not to be penalized by being deprived of the right and opportunity to vote. My right hon. friend does not seem to have much regard for that principle and he urges upon our attention arguments and illustrations of a somewhat singular character. I am not absolutely sure, comparing one part of his speech with another, as to whether he objects to the Bill in its entirety or whether he is prepared to support a measure which will give to those men who would be entitled to vote if they were in Canada the right and opportunity to vote although they are at the front. From one part of his speech I would gather that he was in favour of that measure of justice; but from another part I would gather that he was absolutely opposed to it. Will my right hon. friend inform me as to what I am to understand in that regard?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I certainly am in favour of no extension of the present franchise; but I would give those who have the right to vote an opportunity to do so if it were possible to provide the machinery for it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A great deal of my right hon. friend's speech goes by the board because his argument tended to destroy that position altogether. He argues that any such measure must be absolutely unworkable, that you cannot provide proper safeguards, that the men would be so engaged in military duties that they could not vote. He says that Lord Kitchener will not permit them to vote. But having made these arguments intended to destroy the Bill, he then changes front and admits that men who are on voters' lists in Canada and who could therefore vote if they were here ought to be entitled to vote although they are at the front. It is difficult to understand just what is my hon. friend's position. I maintain that the gallant men who have gone to the front and who have thus shown their willingness and determination to risk and if necessary to sacrifice their lives for their country are entitled to vote whether they are on the list or not; and I say further that according to my apprehension they are entitled to vote, whether they have arrived at the age of 21 years or not. We all know that an arbitrary age must be fixed in our statute, and the age of 21 years is fixed; but we also know that some men at the age of 17 or 18 are as well developed physically and mentally as other men when they attain the age of 25 years. Those men under the age of 21 who have gone to the front to fight for their country have shown the possession of a mental and physical development which ought justly to entitle them to vote if any man is entitled to vote while absent from Canada on the patriotic duty of fighting for his country.

My right hon. friend further argues—and this goes absolutely against his contention in reply to a question from me a moment ago—that our soldiers at the front ought not to be permitted to vote because there are men in Canada carrying on their ordinary avocations who, owing to the conditions under which they earn their livelihood cannot vote. He puts that forward as an argument in the hearing of every hon. gentleman in this House. That argument, if it means anything at all, confounds the very admission he made to me not five minutes ago, because it would exclude those whose names are on the electoral lists as well as all others. I venture to believe that there is a distinction to be found between men engaged properly and legitimately, in their own interest, in ordinary business avocations in Canada and those who have abandoned all considerations of business and of interest and have gone to the front to sacrifice their lives if necessary for the preservation of our institutions and liberties. I venture also to believe that the fathers and the mothers, the brothers and the sisters of these men fighting and risking their lives at the front will not consider the question in the cold-blooded way in which my right hon. friend regards it.

My right hon. friend goes on further—and I will only touch very lightly the

points that he made, because most of them are matters of detail which can be better discussed in committee than on the second reading of the Bill—he goes on to say that our soldiers in France, being beyond the limits of this Dominion, cannot properly be authorized to vote under any law passed by this Parliament. Again he used an argument which confounds the admission made by himself only a few minutes ago, that the men upon the lists in Canada should be permitted to vote if at the front and that we should make some provision for that purpose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I said if you could find the provisions, but I am not able to see yet how it can be done.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would have been better in that case for my right hon. friend to have given us his assistance in framing the measure rather than to have devoted something like an hour to arguing that no such provision was possible. I venture to think that the men in the trenches in France, if we authorize them to vote under a provision made by the Parliament of Canada, are entitled to have their votes cast at a general election in this country; and I know of no constitutional or other reason which would forbid them. Therefore, I pass by that argument of my right hon. friend, because he adduced no reason which commends itself to my judgment in support of it.

Then he argues that it is absolutely and entirely improper and objectionable to permit the men at the front a vote not for a particular candidate but for a particular party, and he declares that in no British country, so far as he was aware, had any legislation of the kind ever been proposed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Except New Zealand.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend, did not, I think, except New Zealand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I excepted it a moment ago.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The principle which the hon. leader of the Opposition condemns has been acted on in New Zealand; and it is well to place on the Hansard the exact provisions of the New Zealand Act as they have been furnished to me by the Minister of Justice, in order that the country may be informed of what has been done in another progressive British dominion along the lines we are proposing to-day. The New Zealand Act is in these words:

An Act to enable the members of the expeditionary forces to exercise their votes at the next general election of members of the House of Representatives and licensing poll.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of New Zealand in Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as the Expeditionary Forces Voting Act, 1914.

2. Every member of any expeditionary force sent from New Zealand to serve in the war in which His Majesty is at present engaged shall be entitled to vote in the manner hereinafter prescribed at the next general election of members of the House of Representatives, and also at the licensing poll taken simultaneously with such election.

3. (1) With respect to the votes to be given by members of any such force at the next general election of members of the House of Representatives the following provisions shall apply:

(a) The vote of each such member shall be recorded on a voting paper in the form in the schedule hereto by striking out the words indicating the parties for whom he does not wish to vote.

(b) Every vote given as aforesaid for any party shall be counted as a vote for the candidate who has been selected in the manner hereinafter prescribed as the candidate representing that party in the electoral district in which the voter resided immediately before joining the expeditionary force.

(c) Such selection shall be made—

(i) In the case of the Government party, by the Prime Minister;

(ii) In the case of the Opposition party, by the leader of the Opposition; and

(iii) In the case of the Labour party, by two members of the House of Representatives (as now constituted) who shall be appointed as selectors by resolution of the said House on the recommendation of a majority of the Labour members of the said House.

(d) If there is no candidate selected as aforesaid as representing the party for which the vote is given, the vote shall not be counted.

(e) Every selection made under paragraphs (b) and (c) hereof shall be gazetted not later than five days after nomination day, and shall be given effect to by returning officers at the election.

(f) A voting paper in the form in the schedule hereto shall be supplied by an electoral officer appointed for the purpose by the chief electoral officer to every member of the said forces who applies for the same.

(g) When the voter has marked his voting paper as aforesaid he shall enclose it in an envelope addressed to the returning officer of the electoral district in which he resided immediately before he joined the force, and having sealed the envolope, shall deliver the same to the electoral officer, who shall forthwith forward it to the chief electoral officer at Wellington.

(2) For the purposes of this section "Government" and "Opposition" mean respectively the Government and Opposition in office on the passing of this Act.

4. With respect to the votes to be given at the licensing poll taken simultaneously with the said general election, the following provisions shall apply:

(a) The vote of each member shall be recorded on the voting papers and in the manner prescribed by the Licensing Act, 1908.

(b) A voting paper on each of the issues submitted at the licensing poll in the forms prescribed as aforesaid shall be supplied by the electoral officer aforesaid to every member who applies to vote under the last preceding section, and shall be dealt with in the manner provided by paragraph (g) of that section.

(c) In the event of the form of the voting paper prescribed for the taking of the licensing poll on the issue of national prohibition being altered during the present session of Parliament, then the votes at the licensing poll under this Act on that issue against national prohibition and for national prohibition respectively, shall be counted as if they had been given for national continuance or for national prohibition or otherwise in accordance with the tenor of the altered form of the voting paper in which the issue is submitted for the determination of the electors at the general election.

5. Not later than seven days before the day fixed for the general election the chief electoral officer shall forward to the returning officer of each electoral district and to the returning officer of each licensing district all envelopes addressed as aforesaid to that returning officer.

6. At the counting of the votes at the said general election and licensing poll the returning officer shall open all envelopes so sent to him, and shall, subject to the foregoing provisions of this Act, deal with the voting papers contained therein as if they had been issued pursuant to an absent voter's permit.

7. No person who has exercised his vote under this Act shall be entitled to vote again at the general election or licensing poll.

8. Electoral officers may be appointed out of New Zealand for the purpose of enabling any person to record his vote under this Act who is a member of any expeditionary force sent out of New Zealand before the passing of this Act.

9. The Governor may, from time to time, by Order in Council, make regulations prescribing anything necessary for carrying this Act into effect.

10. The validity of the election at the said general election in any electoral district or of the licensing poll taken in any licensing district shall not be questioned on the ground that anything has been done irregularly or omitted to be done under this Act, or that for any reason whatever it is found impracticable for any member of any expeditionary force aforesaid to record his vote.

11. This Act shall be deemed to be repealed on the completion of the said general election:

Provided that such repeal shall not affect any proceeding in relation to the said election or to the said licensing poll.

Schedule.

Form of Voting Paper.

Electoral district of

Government

Opposition

Labour

Direction to voter.

The voter must leave untouched the name of the party for which he desires to vote and must strike out the names of all other parties.

I venture to submit that in that Act the legislature of New Zealand has made provision for a more complicated condition of affairs than that for which we are endeavouring to provide in this Act. They have empowered the members of the expeditionary forces of New Zealand sent overseas to vote not only at the parliamentary election, but also upon other issues of a very special character. I venture also to think that in the provisions of the New Zealand Act there are not to be found any greater safeguards than those which we have provided. But if, in addition to the safeguards which already appear in this Bill, there are any other safeguards which can be suggested by any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, we shall be very glad to consider and, if reasonable, to accept them. The very fact that under the New Zealand Act 10,000 men, as I am informed, have cast their votes overseas indicates that legislation of this character is not only effective, but has been found to be thoroughly practicable in actual operation.

My right hon. friend has called attention to the possibility of canvassing, and of inflammatory literature, if one may so term it, being circulated among the men in the trenches, and of passion being thus aroused. Whatever else Lord Kitchener is likely to do, I should think it exceedingly likely that he would put his foot down on anything of this nature. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice went very fully into these matters this morning, and pointed out that there are two duties for the soldier, one of which, the duty to vote, he will be entitled to perform under the provisions of this Act, and the other his military duty, which it is incumbent upon him to perform under the engagement that he took when he volunteered to fight and if necessary to die for his country. He stated most clearly and distinctly that under the conditions which confront the Empire, the military duty must take precedence. But he argued that, if opportunity could be afforded, the men at the front should also be permitted to give their voice in the determination of questions which will affect the Government of this country in the future.

So in respect of all that has been urged in regard to the control of the War Office, we are perfectly willing, and I think the country will be willing, to let the matter be determined in that way.

Then my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) went on to argue, and he did argue, that we must anticipate all kinds of fraud and attempted fraud and corruption among the men at the front. I for one dissent from that view in the strongest possible terms. I venture to think that the men and officers who, at this juncture, are risking their lives for their country may well be trusted by the people of Canada and the Parliament of Canada to vote honestly and without any attempt at fraud or deception. And it did not seen to me at all desirable or appropriate that my right hon. friend should dwell so much on the possibility of fraud in this connection. I believe that these men who have gone to the front have been actuated by a sense of duty, and I decline to believe that a man who to-morrow may have to risk his life in facing the foe, the sternest of all the duties that a soldier has to perform, will to-day have his mind intent on practising electoral corruption and violating the provisions of this Act. These men, I think, can be trusted to vote honestly, and I believe that the officers can be trusted to record their votes honestly. Those in this country whose kinsmen are facing the foe in the trenches will not be inclined to join in the belief and expectation of my right hon. friend, that the just recognition proposed by this Bill, and the refusal to penalize soldiers who are fighting for their country will result in attempted fraud and dishonesty by the gallant men so engaged in that great patriotic duty.

Why, although we have had the most elaborate provisions in our election laws, they have proven insufficient repeatedly in this country whenever they have not been backed up by the honesty of the men who were constituted and appointed to enforce them. Even in Canada we have known that no legislative enactment can be so carried out as to prevent fraud unless we appoint men who are honest; and if we have men who are honest we need no legislative enactment to ensure that an honest result shall be obtained. I recall that with all our safeguards and legislative provisions, a deputy returning officer and a poll clerk went forth in one of our western provinces, pretended to journey into the north 100 or 120 miles, but went in reality only 20 or 30 miles, where they sat down under a tree, filled in 150 names, deposited as many ballots, and came back with the story of a unanimous Liberal vote in that remote part of the constituency. It is impossible to prevent fraud absolutely by legislative enactment. It must depend in the final analysis upon the honesty and integrity of the men who are to carry out the law. I differ from my right hon. friend because I have sufficient confidence in the officers and men who are willing to sacrifice their lives at the front to believe that if this Act is passed its provisions will be carried out honestly and as Parliament intended.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words upon this matter as dispassionately as I know how. I should be glad personally if no words I uttered evoked the slightest applause. I would rather speak to the calm and deliberate judgment of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I have a very strong opinion, which I think I can put with great brevity, about this measure as well as the grounds upon which I found that opinion. I think it is contrary to the spirit of the British army and almost of the British Constitution itself. I regret extremely that a measure of so provocative a nature should be brought in by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), and should have been supported by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). I recall no case in seven years' experience of Parliament where a minister introducing a measure has had his measure so completely turned inside out as it was by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and I recall no case in seven years' experience of Parliament where the feeble effort of the minister were so lightly supported by what I almost thought the unpalatable effort of the right hon. the Prime Minister. I was brought up in a school of politicians who told me that it was dangerous to impute motives and I have always tried to follow the instruction, but it is extremely difficult in this case not to suspect a motive anyway. I think I could prove a motive, if I might do so, on the part of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp), who has occupied the boards in connection with this measure. When he was speaking I addressed to him the question: Has my hon. friend in his mind any machinery by which he
5 p.m. hopes to have the soldiers at the front seized of the issues upon

which the election will be fought? My hon. friend is a somewhat young Parliamentarian and his answer gave his whole case away. He said that there is one issue in regard to which the soldiers will be seized. My hon. friend spoke with the approbation, and under the smiling countenance, of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), whom I suspect very strongly as being the originator of this measure and, if my hon. friend's words had any meaning at all, they meant that there was one issue upon which he wished the soldier to vote, and he was persuaded that the soldier would vote upon his side of the issue. I give that for what it is worth as lending colour to the suspicion which I confess I myself entertain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was that issue?

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend will forego his right of cross-examination for a moment. There is nothing that surprise me more in this House than the eagerness with which hon. gentlemen opposite go to the United States, New Zealand, or anywhere but Britain for an argument to support a bad case. They are the British party—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: They are the upholders of British institutions—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: They say they are the British party—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, but nothing that is done in Britain meets with their approval. In the last election they were the anti-American party, but when they want to justify a procedure in regard to voting which is anti-British they immediately go south for the approval of the United States, and if they have that they think the whole thing is settled. Failing to settle it by the United States, the Prime Minister reads a whole Act that has been introduced in the little colony of New Zealand with less than a million people. I do not want to detract from what is done in New Zealand, but I venture to think there is not a man in this House who would have a more acute difference with nine-tenths of the legislation that is passed in New Zealand than the Prime Minister. Why, New Zealand is the hot bed of socialism. Just imagine the leader of the great Conservative party, supported by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) who, if he has one point stronger than another it is opposition to socialism, going to New Zealand to get support for a nostrum like this. The Minister of Justice, in reply to a question I put to him, said that he thought the last thing we should do would be to go to the War Office in Britain to find out what legislation we should enact in Canada upon such a subject as this. He and I just differ one hundred per cent upon that conclusion and I will tell him why. Having regard to this particular measure, it was the first thing he should have done and for a very practical reason. If the war authorities in Great Britain, who have been admitted to be the supreme court in this matter, both by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister should proceed to overrule the measure, in the name of goodness, what is the use of passing the measure at a time when we all want to get home and when the session has lasted too long now in the peculiar circumstances in which the British Empire finds itself? The best that can be said for the Government is that they are introducing a measure which is going to be useless because it will I should suppose be overruled by the military authorities in Great Britain. That is a very strong reason why the Government should have known exactly the attitude of the militray authorities of Great Britain before they proceeded to introduce a measure which I have already described as of an exceedingly provocative nature.

Mr. WILCOX: Why did they not overrule the Parliament of New Zealand?

Mr. CLARK: Perhaps my hon. friend is better able to speak in regard to the Parliament of New Zealand than I am. I cannot discover as yet where the New Zealand soldiers voted. Does my hon. friend know if they voted in the trenches?

Mr. WILCOX: I am satisfied when I know they voted.

Mr. CLARK: I personally would oppose this measure because when men are gathered under arms for the purpose of war, they are and have always been recognized in the old country as men apart, and there has always been the most acute distinction drawn between the civilian population and the army. The army has been kept from interference in politics; the civilian population has been kept supreme just because it is the master, and the army is not allowed to interfere. The army is the executive arm of the civilian authority for certain specific purposes. I think that is

a distinction which goes to the very root of British practice, British thought, and the British constitution itself. It is on the surface of things that the moment men are gathered under arms for the specific purpose of war, their minds ought to be left intent upon the supreme duty of saving the country, because they have no less duty on hand, and the Government or the politician who puts anything in the way of their full discharge of that duty is guilty—perhaps unwittingly—of putting an obstruction in the way of the prosecution of that war in which we are all engaged. So much for the principle.

To dream of men voting at the front is to dream of men having their discipline upset and having their minds taken away from the only work on hand for them—and so they recognize it as I have the very best reason for knowing. It is the only work they think of day or night—the only work they care for. I supposed, however, that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice would have done what I thought was the first thing he should have done—and tried to find out the mind of Lord Kitchener on the subject. Need any one of us be in any doubt what his mind is? We all read at the time—although the Government had evidently forgotten it, the speech which that extraordinary man delivered in the House of Lords, after he accepted the position of War Minister. In that speech he was most careful to guard himself from being suspected of being concerned in the general politics of the Government which he had joined. He explained that he had taken up his duties for three years or for the term of the war, and that he had taken those duties upon him as a soldier. Then he used the sentence, which if the Government gives it the consideration which is due to the utterances that proceed from Lord Kitchener at the present moment, ought to lead them at once to withdraw this measure. He said: "As a soldier I have no politics." That is his attitude without a doubt, because Lord Kitchener always uses language that is full of meaning and very easily understood. He emphatically divested himself of political beliefs and of any desire to interfere in politics. My objections to this measure of the Government is that it proposes to place the duty upon all the Canadian soldiers who are under the command of that great man, of taking a course of conduct and following a rule of conduct diametrically opposed to the rule which he has laid down for himself. Is it necessary to argue this any further? When he said: "as a soldier, I have no politics," it is recorded that the House of Lords, a body which is usually very calm in its expression of approval, applauded vociferously, and his attitude was at once endorsed by the applause of a body which I suppose some hon. gentlemen opposite almost worship, or did worship until it was curtailed so mightily of its power a few years ago.

The Minister of Justice asked us to suggest a better method than that proposed and I am going, in all seriousness, to suggest a better method of dealing with this question. The idea of having the soldiers vote while they are assembled for the purpose of war has behind it another idea, and the Government should entertain neither the one idea nor the other. The soldiers can vote only if there is an election, and I want to tell the Government something very plainly, without the slightest passion—and I think I shall find some endorsement in remarks which I regret very much not to have heard. I was absent from the city at the time my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce delivered his very moderate and able speech on the Budget; I was absent when he delivered that patriotic peroration, in which he told the House and the country that we should have only one thought. The Government ought not to have any thought of an election while the soldiers are assembled for purposes of war. I say this, if the House will believe me, without the slightest thought of what is going to happen to my party, and still less of what is going to happen to myself. I suppose there is not a man in this House who, so far as personal ambition goes, attaches less interest than I do to the question whether or not he will ever be back here again after the next general election. From the point of view of the best interest of Canada, from the point of view of the best interest of the Empire, and from the point of view of the successful prosecution of the greatest fight for the greatest object that ever engaged the highest civilizations of the world against what we believe to be lower and despotic civilizations, the Government have enough on hand to do what I have given them credit for doing in the main—seeing this fight through to a finish, without thinking of elections. That, however, is a matter between them and their consciences. What I have said I have said upon the point, and I do not think the moderate men of this country will view the measure before us with favour. They will not view it with

favour upon its merits, and they will view it with still greater disfavour because of the consideration upon which I have now dealt for a moment, that is, that the Government are wondering, if we can judge appearances, when it is going to be a good time to spring an election.

I do not want to make a contrast between this Government and the Government of Great Britain. But everybody knows that the thought has seriously occurred to that Government that they should extend their term so that they can do as the soldiers are doing—stick to their job and see it through. I rather think my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden), judging from his general constitution, would want to stick to his job and have a voice in the settlement of affairs after the war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: He will be there.

Mr. CLARK: I could not enter into that without differing in opinion and giving good reasons for it, and I do not want to do that. I have the best reasons for knowing, and for stating, that the soldiers at the front are not thinking about votes, and not thinking about elections in Canada. I had, only yesterday, correspondence which informs me that men of our own first troops to go into the fight are feeling, to the last man amongst them, the strain of the campaign, and that not one of them feels himself as good a man physically as when he went into the trenches. I have had this information further, that the horror and the suffering which they are looking upon are leading them to wonder whether there is such a thing as Christianity in the world and what the end of all this business is to be. I can imagine this Government—I do not want to touch upon anything controversial—going to these soldiers at the front and saying: Some of our friends did not take good care to give you boots, but we are coming to give you votes. What do you think would be the attitude of these men, devoted to what they believe a holy cause of warfare, animated by the thoughts I have mentioned? I can imagine no man among them worthy of admiration—and I believe they are all such men—who would not turn to the Government and say: We are devoted to the sacred cause of repatriating the Belgians; we are devoted to the sacred cause of human freedom; we are going through untold sufferings and untold horrors to prosecute that cause to a successful issue—in the name of God and of all goodness do not add to these horrors and these sufferings the horrors of the Public Accounts Committee.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): I had not the honour of being a member of the committee to which was submitted the motion of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp), and as a result of whose deliberations the Bill now before the House comes up for consideration. I do not feel competent to discuss, nor do I think it would be proper to discuss at this stage, the several clauses and the various provisions of the Bill; but it is a circumstance of happy augury that those who on the floor of Parliament so far in this debate have opposed it, have opposed it not because of any defects in the machinery, but firstly, lastly and all the time, on the ground that the very principle of the Bill is wrong. They are opposed to soldiers being given the right to vote, and opposed to the right of citizenship being vouchsafed to them as well as the rights they enjoy as soldiers. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) is very deeply grieved that any such Bill, involving, as he says, a controversial principle, should be launched on Parliament this session. What reason had we to believe that this Bill involved a controversial principle? The principle of this Bill was under discussion on the 22nd of February last, on the motion of the hon. member ruary last, on the motion of the hon. member opposite spoke on that motion, and neither of them opposed the principle of the Bill. The Opposition was represented on that occasion chiefly by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). Did he take up the cry of the hon. member for Red Deer this afternoon, that it was a sacrilege to have a soldier vote; or that a soldier, because he is a soldier, must not vote, because to vote is to be a politician? Was that his attitude? No. Speaking for the Opposition he said he believed in soldiers voting, and he hoped that machinery to that end could be provided. "I agree with all that has been said," said the hon. gentleman, "as to the wisdom of having our volunteers exercise their franchise"; and I quote from page 364 of Hansard of the 22nd of February. Later in his speech he elaborated that in these words:

> I do not wish to be too emphatic in the matter, but I see almost unsurmountable difficulties in the way of our trying to apply this principle to our volunteers, particularly to those outside our own country. As to those who are in Canada. I think the modus operandi might be worked out without very much difficulty.

The attitude of the Opposition then was: There will be difficulties to be surmounted in hedging about the method of voting sufficient safeguards, and the machinery will not be easily evolved; but we are one with you in extending the franchise to the soldier, and in giving the soldier all the rights of citizenship and not a part of them. Why, then, had we any reason to anticipate that this Bill involved a controversial principle? This principle was acceded to by hon. gentlemen opposite before it was submitted to the committee. As to the efficiency of the machinery provided, as to the different clauses of the Bill, these may well await discussion until we get into Committee of the Whole.

The hon. member for Red Deer is exceedingly exercised because he claims it is against the fundamental principle, which is acknowledged by British statesmen; that the soldier must have no politics. And he quotes the words of Lord Kitchener, that as a soldier, he has no politics. But does that mean that because he is a soldier he is no longer a citizen? While he has no politics as a soldier, is he to have no political rights as a citizen?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: The hon. gentleman will not dispute that I carefully spoke of soldiers assembled for the purpose of war, exactly as I understood Lord Kitchener to speak, when he spoke of having taken special duties upon himself for the time of the war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman says he referred to soldiers assembled for the purposes of war on the battlefield; but the very man who used these words was not on the battlefield. Lord Kitchener, who gave that dictum was at that very time a member of the Cabinet of Great Britain. He assumed that position as a soldier, and he stated, that as a soldier, he had no politics. Did he wish to give the doctrine to the country that no soldier under his command, whether at home or in the foreign field, was to have the right to vote, or to give expression to his views on politics? Does the hon. member for Red Deer think he meant that? If so, where does his leader stand, who, to-day, in this House, said he was in favour of a soldier voting on the battlefield, providing he had the right to vote at home.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Lord Kitchener is my leader, and good enough for my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In matters of war, Lord Kitchener is good enough for me, but in the House of Commons I acknowledge the leadership of the leader of the Government. I am glad to see that, at last, the hon. member for Red Deer repudiates his leader.

We have no use, the hon. member says, for anything British; the actions of the British Government do not satisfy us. He has never seen us, he said, accord with anything done in Britain. I remember one occasion upon which the opinion of the British Government was given on a matter of which they should know something; on a matter upon which they should be to us the highest authority; on a matter in respect of which they gave their opinion to this Parliament in the most explicit and decided manner. I remember that their authority was repudiated by hon. gentlemen opposite, and in the most violent language by the hon. member for Red Deer himself. The hon. gentleman spurns the example of New Zealand. The example of that little country which, he says, is socialistically mad, which has a population of less than one million—he has no use for. But it is only a year since he stood up in the House and castigated hon. gentlemen on this side of the House because they did not follow, in the most pitifully copying manner, the example of New Zealand. Not that there was anything to criticise adversely in the action of New Zealand on that occasion; we do not and never did say that, from their standpoint, they did anything wrong. But it was an example which did not come into question then at all, and, even though it did not come into question, the hon. member for Red Deer proposed that we should follow that example against the advice of the Admiralty of Britain. The hon. gentleman says that the British example is not good enough. When did the action taken by New Zealand cease to be a British example? Is New Zealand not a member of the family of Britain? Is New Zealand not the first British country to which this question ever appealed, the first British country to decide the issue and to determine whether or not the soldiers have a right to vote? The British nation was on a previous occasion at war during election time. One hundred years ago, when Pitt fought against Fox in the British House of Commons, it was necessary to hold elections in time of war. But at that time they did not have manhood suffrage, as they have to-day, and I doubt

really whether at that time very many of the men who were fighting the battles of Great Britain across the English channel would have had the right to vote had they been at home. The question which we are now considering did not present itself to Britain then, nor has it presented itself to Britain since. No election was held during the South African war, which occurred about fifteen years ago, and there is no British example as against the position taken by this Government.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: The hon. member, I presume, does not want to misrepresent the facts. The South African war lasted fully a year after the election of 1900, which took place during that war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I accept the correction of the hon. memebr for Red Deer; I understood that the election was held after the war was over. But if he is correct, let him never more stand in the House of Commons and plead the example of Great Britain against an election being held in time of war.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: There were different stages of that war; the guerilla warfare lasted for a year and a half. It is perfectly true that Mr. Chamberlain went to the country in the year 1900 with the cry "the war is over"; so that to have an election he had to contend that the war was over. John Burns remarked at the time that the war was over—it was all over the shop.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have tried to get the exact viewpoint of the hon. member for Red Deer, and if I have caught it in this case, it is this: that it is all right to have an election during the progress of guerilla warfare, but if you can apply any other adjective to the war, then it is wrong to have an election. There were stages of the war, and the British election was held a year before the end of the war. That is the reason why the hon. gentleman objects to an election now.

Mr. CLARK: Before the signing of peace.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The British election was held a year before the signing of peace, according to the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. CLARK: Something like a year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Something like a year before, so that if the hon. gentleman is loyal to British example, and if he believes that we are within a year of the termination of the war, he will cease to oppose an election.

It is an historic principle of British jurisprudence that the civilians must rule, not the soldiers; that the civilian must be supreme and not the military authorities. In this respect British institutions differ radically from those of Germany, and in the expression of that principle I agree with the hon. member. But is it to be argued that upon that ground soldiers should be deprived of the franchise? Is that the interpretation put upon that principle by the British Government?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If soldiers must not be deprived of the franchise, then why not vote for this Bill?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Does not my hon. friend see the distinction between the soldier fighting in the trenches and the soldier who becomes a civilian after the war is over and he is at his own home?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see it very clearly, and will explain to the hon. member for Red Deer where that puts him. The civilian must be supreme, not the soldier, and the hon. gentleman means the soldier at home. The hon. gentleman is quite content that the soldier at home, the parade soldier, who is not fighting, shall be supreme and shall dominate the civilian, but he is determined that the soldier who fights shall have nothing to say at all. What is at the bottom of the theory in Britain that the civilian must control the affairs of state and that the soldier must not gain ascendancy over him? It is this: The ascendancy of the soldier means a military autocracy such as they have in Germany, and that is what is to be feared. But is there any reason why the ascendancy of the soldier who is not at war should be any more dangerous than the ascendancy of the soldier who is at war? What is the difference? What have we to fear from the vote of a man on the battlefield because he is a soldier, any more than we have to fear from the vote of the man at home, who is a soldier and who refuses to go to the battlefield? It must be plain to the right hon. leader of the Opposition—because I am sure that he struggled hard to keep within the pale of reason in the speech that he delivered—that all that has been advanced in favour of his position by his lieutenant from Red Deer is so much vapour.

It is argued also that we should have asked the advice of Lork Kitchener before we adopted the principle that in so far

as we can give power to the soldiers on the battlefield to vote. We should do so. Lord Kitchener or Sir John French as head of the service, has the command for the time being of our soldiers on the battlefield, and I do not dispute the truth of the assertion that, if he wishes, he can prevent the operation of any provision for carrying out this proposed legislation. He can refuse to the soldiers authority to vote, even though we, in so far as we are able to give it, are ready to extend to them that authority. But is the fact that Lord Kitchener has the right to exercise his jurisdiction any reason why we should refuse, within our province, to exercise ours? If, as the hon. member for Red Deer says, this legislation will be vetoed by Lord Kitchener, let me ask him why he takes up the time of the House in an attempt to defeat it here? He does not know what the attitude of Lord Kitchener will be, any more than I do. I assume that Lord Kitchener will extend to this country the same courtesy that he extended to New Zealand; I know of no reason why he should show less respect for the opinion of the Parliament of Canada than he shows for the opinion of the Parliament of New Zealand. If the hon. member for Red Deer knows of any reason why he should, I shall be pleased to have him give it to me.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Where did the New Zealanders vote?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The New Zealanders voted while under the jurisdiction of Lord Kitchener, and while away from their own country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Where?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They voted in a foreign land.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Name it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Name the country? Would it be any different if they voted in Belgium or France or Egypt?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: They did not vote in either Belgium or France. Are any of them there?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman tell me? I do not know where they voted.

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend ought to know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know enough for the purposes of my argument, that they voted outside the jurisdiction of the New Zealand authorities and within the jurisdiction of Lord Kitchener. Will the hon. member for Red Deer tell me where they voted? They voted on whatever battlefield or at whatever other place they were at the time the election was on, and that is where the soldiers of Canada would vote should there be an election that would demand the exercise of the franchise while they are at the front.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition has the greatest dread of election campaign literature getting into the trenches. No vote could be taken when there would be less to fear from the invasion of campaign literature than such as is contemplated by this Bill. The men are under the command of the British authorities and to their wisdom and to their good sense we can safely leave such questions as that, feeling certain that nothing will be permitted by the British authorities that will interfere with the efficiency of a soldier as a soldier on the battlefield.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In regard to section 4, my hon. friend says that the voting, the marking of the ballot, is to be under the supervision of a British officer. What is meant by those words?

> The volunteer may thereupon make affidavit in form B before any commissioned officer in the Canadian military forces.

Does that mean a British officer?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are all British officers.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is limited to a Canadian officer, a commissioned officer in the Canadian military forces. Does that not mean a Canadian officer?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It means a Canadian officer who by service abroad becomes a British officer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman said a British officer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He undoubtedly would be a British officer. What I referred to was the paramount jurisdiction of the war authorities to control in every way the admission of any kind of literature to the men at the front. They have that control in the war office and they will exercise it by such officers as they select. We may safely trust to them that the soldier would be protected from any undue influence in the exercise of his franchise. The hon. member for Red Deer was careful not to be cross-examined. He was willing to give his evidence so long as he

was subjected to no cross-examination. He quoted from the speech of the hon. member for Ottawa, endeavouring to assign to his words some motive which he said was behind the Government in introducing this legislation. He asked the hon. member for Ottawa if the soldiers at the front would know about the issues. He refused to tell the House what the hon. member for Ottawa answered. The hon. member for Ottawa answered that there was one thing about which the soldier at the front would know and that was how they were equipped by the people of Canada and the Government of Canada for the purposes of war. If we are to follow hon. gentlemen opposite, if we are to take seriously their activities within the last few weeks, we must come to the conclusion that the question of the adequacy of the equipment is going to be one of the foremost questions in any campaign that may be waged, so that on one issue launched by hon. gentlemen opposite they should surely not be afraid to take the opinion of those who would best know the facts and who would not have to be bombarded by literature from one side or the other. The right hon. leader of the Opposition is afraid that campaign literature will get in. His lieutenant from Red Deer is afraid they will not know the issues. The one fears the subject for one reason and the other fears it for an exactly opposite reason. I apprehend that there is no reason to fear it for either reason. Should there be an election it is well that the soldier, while he exercises his functions as a soldier, should not be deprived of the exercise of his functions as a citizen. That is the purpose of the Bill and that only; and it has at all times been a cardinal feature of British parliamentary and political life that a soldier or a citizen had the same right, and that a soldier, by becoming a soldier, has not in any way his functions or his rights as a citizen reduced.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: A difference arose on a point of fact with regard to where the New Zealand soldiers voted. I have consulted with some military members of the House, and my hon. friend asserted that they were under the jurisdiction of Lord Kitchener. These military members inform me that their impression is—they have no documentary evidence—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friends who laugh do not believe in any impressions. They have the impression that they voted in Wellington before leaving New Zealand.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: My authority was the cablegram read by the Minister of Justice, which the member should have heard.

Mr. MURPHY: Which did not say where they voted.

Mr. DOHERTY: The statement of the Prime Minister was that the men voted under the Bill that was read, and the Bill has no application except to the soldiers outside of New Zealand.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the Minister of Justice a copy of the Act as it finally passed or simply a copy of the Bill that was introduced in the New Zealand Parliament?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have a copy of the proposed Bill. The question asked of the Prime Minister of New Zealand was whether the proposed Bill giving the soldiers a vote had been passed, and the answer was to that question:

> Bill referred to passed and votes of soldiers who left before general election recorded. Total votes, 10,000.

So, while I have only a copy of the proposed Bill, the question asked of the Prime Minister of New Zealand was whether the proposed Bill was passed and he said yes, the proposed Bill was passed.

Mr. CLARK: Does my hon. friend think that language contains the meaning that the vote was recorded after they left?

Mr. DOHERTY (reading):

> And votes of all soldiers who left before general election recorded.

So that they left before the general election and the Bill itself recognized that they had then left, because it is a Bill to enable the soldiers who had left to vote.

Mr. MURPHY: If they had not, the vote could be recorded anyway.

Mr. DOHERTY: Those who stayed at home would have their votes recorded under a totally different Bill. This was a Bill exclusively passed for men who when the Bill was passed had already left New Zealand. The Prime Minister of New Zealand was asked if that proposed Bill passed, and he said yes. He was asked if the vote was taken, and he said: Votes of all soldiers who left before the general election recorded.

Mr. MURPHY: It does not say when.

Mr. DOHERTY: Certainly, unless it is assumed that, being asked a perfectly clear

question, the Prime Minister of New Zealand chose to give an ambiguous or misleading answer. It seems to me that it is perfectly clear that when he was asked whether a proposed Bill which only had application to soldiers who had already left the country when the Bill was proposed, had passed and whether the vote was taken, and he answered that the Bill had passed and that the votes of soldiers who left before the general election had been recorded—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: My own impression is that they voted before they left, otherwise they voted by marconigram. When he gets the facts, my hon. friend will find that they voted before they left New Zealand. I would assert that.

Mr. NESBITT: Is it not a fact that the Bill that the hon. member speaks of was passed authorizing these men to vote previous to leaving New Zealand?

Mr. DOHERTY: Absolutely the contrary.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Times, that I took for my authority, certainly so stated.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know what The Times stated. But I do know that the Bill was applicable only to soldiers who had already left the country; for any soldier who was still in New Zealand at the time of the election did not need that Bill at all in order to vote; he could vote under the ordinary law. The Prime Minister of New Zealand was asked whether the New Zealand Parliament had passed the proposed Bill to enable men who had left to vote. He answered, Yes. He was then asked, was the vote taken? By that I cannot conceive that the Prime Minister understood anything except, was the vote provided for in that Bill taken? If the question does not mean that, it has no meaning at all. He answered, Yes; and further stated that 10,000 votes had been recorded.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would my hon. friend allow me to see the telegram that was sent to the Prime Minister of New Zealand, and the answer. I think it was most unfortunate that my hon. friend did not impress upon the Parliamentary Counsel to find out in his cable to New Zealand whether the Bill was passed as introduced. Many Bills are introduced in this Parliament and every other parliament in the world in regard to which it would be quite correct to say that they had passed, even though they had been amended. What I would assume might be correct, from the cablegram of the Prime Minister of New Zealand, is that the Bill as it finally passed allowed those soldiers who were to leave New Zealand to register their votes for or against the Government. That might well be the case, for the Government expected a general election. Then when the election came on the votes would be counted by the returning officers.

Mr. DOHERTY: It would be possible to conceive of all these things were it not for the fact that so far as the soldiers still in New Zealand were concerned, no Bill was required at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Oh, no.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The Bill had absolutely nothing to do with any soldiers except those who had left New Zealand when the Bill was introduced, and for the simple reason that under the general law the soldiers still in New Zealand were already entitled to vote. I have asked the question, was the Bill that was introduced passed? The question that I did ask was, was the proposed Bill passed? What distinction does the hon gentleman make between the proposed Bill and the introduced Bill? I think my question was perfectly clear, and the answer to that question was, yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am sorry that I cannot think the minister has made it absolutely clear that soldiers' votes were taken after the soldiers had left New Zealand. My hon. friend says that it would have been of no advantage to have the enactments which I say might have been made, for he says the existing law allowed votes of soldiers to be taken if the soldiers were in New Zealand at the time of the election.

Mr. DOHERTY: The votes of anybody.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Now it is entirely possible that this New Zealand Bill may have provided that soldiers going abroad could, before they left, mark their ballots either for or against the Government, and that when the election came on the returning officers entered the votes accordingly. My hon. friend who sits behind me says that he is satisfied from a statement in the Times that that was done. It might very easily have been done. In New Zealand they were expecting a general election. The soldiers were going to leave the country, and the Government might very well have provided that before the soldiers left they should be given an opportunity to register their votes.

Mr. DOHERTY: Why did they make the Bill applicable only to soldiers who had left?

Mr. PUGSLEY: We do not know that the Bill passed in that form. My hon. friend may be guessing with absolute accuracy, but it is not always safe to guess that a Parliament has passed a Bill in the form in which it was introduced. My hon. friend has often seen himself amending his own Bills. That is not at all an unlikely thing to happen to any Bill.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was about to make some reference to the provisions of the Bill which I think should properly be considered on the motion for the second reading, and in that connection I might express my thanks to the Minister of Justice for suggesting that I might be able to give some assistance in amending the Bill in case its principle should be approved of. Let me say to the minister that like my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), I am in favour of giving soldiers the right to vote providing it can be done in such a way as not to interfere with the proper performance of their duties and also provided that it can be surrounded with the proper safeguards. In speaking of this Bill, I am inclined to think that it has not been prepared with sufficient care to merit the respectful consideration of this House. I cannot think that the Minister of Justice has had his heart in this measure at all. He protested, Mr. Speaker, with eloquence and in the most sincere tones, that he was sincere about the measure. He protested three or four times and each time with a little more strength. I rather thought that the hon. gentleman was seeking to convince himself as well as to convince this House of his sincerity, else why did he protest so much?

Mr. DOHERTY: My sincerity was questioned.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend has heard the story of the maiden who, when she protested so much it excited a considerable degree of suspicion. Just let me call my hon. friend's attention to section 4:

> 4. The volunteer may thereupon make the affidavit in form B before any commissioned officer in the Canadian military forces, and, after making the affidavit, mark the ballot paper as a vote for the Government or the Opposition or for the independent candidate, in the presence of the said commissioned officer, but in such a manner as not to disclose to the officer how he is voting, and shall fold the ballot paper so that it cannot be read and shall then place the same, together with the affidavit, in an envelope upon the back of which shall be endorsed a certificate in form C, which certificate shall be signed by such officer.

Now, let me read the certificate:

> I hereby certify that the document contained in this envelope was written in my presence by (here insert name and rank and name of corps in which voter is serving), and according to the best information at my disposal I believe that the statements made in the affidavits are true.

That is the whole of the endorsement that is to be upon the envelope. The envelope is sealed. What then is to be done?

> The envelopes containing the ballot papers and affidavits shall then be sent by post to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who shall keep a record of them, place them in a package carefully sealed and marked on the outside "Soldiers Votes" and forward them by registered post to the returning officer of the electoral district in which such election is to be held.

That is the whole direction. Would my hon. friend just pay attention to the language of this section? I would like my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to consider it also and see whether there is any meaning in it or whether it does not indicate the preparation of the Bill in the most slovenly way possible and in a manner which indicates that the Minister of Justice has really not had his heart in the measure and has really not given any attention to it. There is to be nothing endorsed upon the envelope except the certificate of the officer that the envelope contains the affidavit, etc., of so and so, simply giving the name of the corps in which he is serving, not giving his residence, not giving the electoral district in which he has the right to vote. Then the officer has to send all these envelopes to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has to keep a record of them, he is not to open them, he does not know to which district any one of these voters belongs, he has to endorse on the outside "soldiers' vote" and he has to forward these envelopes by registered post to the returning officer in the electoral district in which such election is to be held.

Mr. DOHERTY: Who has to do that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Where is the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery going to send them?

Mr. DOHERTY: That is manifestly an error in the printing of the form. I plead

guilty to not seeing to the correction of the printed form, but it was intended that on the back of the envelope there should be endorsed, in addition to the name and the corps, the address given by the soldier in the affidavit.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Possibly that should be on the certificate?

Mr. DOHERTY: On the certificate, so that from the certificate the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery might know where to send the envelope of the man who claims to be entitled to vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well, then, the section is wrong, because it says that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery "shall forward them by registered post to the returning officer of the electoral district in which such election is to be held."

Mr. DOHERTY: Certainly, because it is supposed that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, having the address of the man, will be able to determine exactly what his electoral district is. It was first suggested that we should put in the electoral district, but it was pointed out that the soldier might not know the electoral district in which he was entitled to vote. For instance, in the city of Montreal, a soldier would know perfectly well where he had resided, the street and number, but he might not know precisely which of the electoral districts it was in, and to avoid the possibility of doubt about that, we substituted the address of the place where he had lived. It was intended—it is a mere omission in the form—that the address should appear on the certificate on the back of the envelope, and from that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will easily be able to ascertain what the electoral district is, and see that the envelope goes to the right electoral district.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Of course, I did not know what errors the minister had made or what omissions there were; I was merely speaking of the Bill as we have it.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman is entitled to speak of the Bill as it stands. Of course, a matter of that sort might more properly be dealt with in the committee. It could hardly be held as touching upon the principle of the Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think it does, because we have to point out the difficulties that surround the carrying out of the proposed measure. It was stated here that British officers could be trusted to see that the private marked his ballot paper, that we could safely rely upon their fairness, and that we need not be anxious to have any precautions taken. As was pointed out, this Parliament would have no right to impose any duty upon a British officer, and apparently the Minister of Justice has had that in mind, because, while in subsection 2 it is left to the discretion of the High Commissioner for Canada to determine what officers these ballots shall be sent to, and while there is nothing in the Bill to state who the officers shall be, it is provided by section 4 that the ballot must be marked in presence of a commissioned officer in the Canadian military forces.

That absolutely excludes a British commissioned officer because a British officer is not a commissioned officer in the Canadian military forces. The officer must be a Canadian officer and is it possible that my hon. friend and those on the committee who assisted him in framing this Bill had in mind that there are in England to-day some officers of the Canadian forces, who, as some English newspapers asserted, were selected because of their political claims rather than of their military fitness? Is it possible that the minister has in view some officers who are still in England, who have not been sent to the front, whom General Alderson has no thought of sending to the front, whom he deems incapable of taking proper command and in whose care he would not entrust the lives of Canadian soldiers? Is it possible that the minister thinks that those gentlemen might be very good men to appoint as officers to whom the ballots might be sent?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to argue that the officers who did not receive appointments under General Alderson and who returned were political appointees?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, quite a number of them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only one whom I happen to know, and who I understand led back the officers who were not appointed by General Alderson, was a Liberal who was defeated in the local elections in Manitoba.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That might be. I was not speaking particularly of those who came back to Canada; I was speaking rather of those who remain in England, whom General Alderson has not sent to the front and whom, if rumour is true, he will never send to the front. Is that why the minister has given this wide discretion

that these affidavits may be made before and ballots marked in presence of any Canadian commissioned officer in the military forces? Is that why he has not limited it to officers who are in command of the forces, because it must be apparent to the House that under this any commissioned officer, who has gone over to England and who may or may not be serving with the forces at the front may be appointed by the High Commissioner for the purpose of taking these affidavits and receiving the ballots. I do not hesitate to say that, in respect of some of those officers at all events—and they are rather well known to members of this House—I would desire to see some safeguards placed around the marking of the ballots and their being returned to Canada. I am not at all afraid to say that, and gentlemen who realize whom I have in mind, I think will be disposed to agree with me.

It is provided not merely that ballots shall be given to those soldiers who ask for them, but that any quantity of ballots may be sent to the High Commissioner and any quantity distributed. We have no safeguard whatever provided in this Bill as to the ballots being marked by those who are entitled to vote, or as to the ballots which are so marked finding their way back to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. That is a fundamental objection which I find to the Bill in making provision for soldiers who are out of Canada voting at a Canadian election. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has pointed out in language much stronger and clearer than any I can employ what, from a military standpoint, from the standpoint of the interest of the Empire and from the viewpoint which Lord Kitchener is likely to take of the matter, seemed to me an insuperable objection to having the vote taken at the front. It may be asked of me, how, in case I think it would be desirable to give soldiers the right to vote, I would have provided for it. I would have provided for it at the session of Parliament which was held in August before the soldiers went to the front, and I would have made provision for those who were going away to vote by marking their ballots before they left the country. In that way the matter might easily have been accomplished, and proper safeguards would have been thrown around the voting, and that is the way in which for the most part I believe the New Zealand Government has provided

[Mr. Pugsley.]

for voting. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice read a despatch from the Prime Minister of New Zealand, in which it stated:

> In reply cable 28th from your clerk House of Commons Bill referred to passed and votes of all soldiers who left before general election recorded, total votes 10,000.

My hon. friend, as I thought, led the House to believe that total of 10,000 must be made up of soldiers who had actually gone to the front before they had recorded their votes. An examination of the Bill, a copy of which I have before me, does not show that, because it provides that electoral officers in New Zealand shall receive the votes of the soldiers. It is true it provides that the New Zealand Government may appoint electoral officers outside of New Zealand, but for the purpose of taking the votes not of those who had not left New Zealand before it had passed, but of those who had left New Zealand before it had passed, therefore showing that in the opinion of the Parliament and Government of New Zealand, it was only to meet the case of soldiers who had left before the Act had passed that they thought it desirable to allow this provision, but soldiers who might leave after the Act went into force must register their votes in New Zealand, and if they did not do so, they could not do it after they had gone abroad. Therefore, if I am right in this—and I will endeavour to show the House that I am right—it is possible that the whole 10,000 votes recorded were recorded in New Zealand after the Act passed, but before the soldiers departed from New Zealand to engage in the war.

Let me call the attention of the House to the provisions in the New Zealand Bill. By paragraph (f) of subsection 1 of section 3 it is provided as follows:

> A voting paper in the form in the schedule hereto shall be supplied by an electoral officer appointed for the purpose by the chief electoral officer to every member of the said forces who applies for the same.

The Act is speaking here evidently of electoral officers in New Zealand, not of people who might be appointed out of New Zealand.

By paragraph (g) it is provided:

> When the voter has marked his voting paper as aforesaid he shall enclose it in an envelope addressed to the returning officer of the electoral district in which he resided immediatley before he joined the force, and having sealed the envelope, shall deliver the same to the electoral officer, who shall forthwith forward it to the chief electoral officer at Wellington.

This provision is entirely for soldiers who were then in New Zealand and before they left that country.

Then, we find by section 8, a provision for the polling of votes of members of expeditionary forces sent out of New Zealand before the passing of the Act:

> Electoral officers may be appointed out of New Zealand for the purpose of enabling any person to record his vote under this Act who is a member of any expeditionary force sent out of New Zealand before the passing of this Act.

I think it must be clear to the minister that he is in error in stating to the House that this whole ten thousand votes must have been of soldiers who were out of the country at the time they marked their ballots. On the contrary, it provides for the marking of ballots by soldiers who leave the country after the Act was passed. These men are to vote in New Zealand. And it distinctly provides, contrary to the terms of this Bill, that any soldier who leaves the country after the Act is passed must register his vote before he leaves or he will not be allowed to register it at all.

Mr. DOHERTY: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a word? He says I was mistaken, and he reads section 8 to prove it. But section 2 provides for all expeditionary forces sent from New Zealand to serve in the war, and they have the right to vote. There is further information on this point which I give now so that the hon. gentleman may know just upon what I rely. If he will turn to the London Times of the 12th December, he will find the following, dated Wellington, N.Z.:

> According to the latest parliamentary returns, 38 Government, 30 Opposition and 8 Labour members have been elected, including Social Democrats. As the Labour members support the Opposition, this makes the parties equal. But the votes of absentees and of members of the expeditionary forces have not yet been counted, and they may affect the result in several cases where the vote is close. There are about 10,000 voters in Egypt and Samoa, and 2,000 are encamped in the Dominion.

The figure of 10,000 in Egypt and Samoa, my hon. friend will notice, tallies exactly with the number of voters mentioned in the telegram of the Prime Minister of New Zealand.

Mr. GERMAN: But if the hon. minister will follow the Times he will find that up to the 24th of September these 10,000 votes were not yet returned to New Zealand.

Mr. DOHERTY: But that does not say that they were not registered in Egypt and Samoa.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That does not answer the criticism I made. What I pointed out was that my hon. friend sought, it seemed to me, to convey the impression that the New Zealand Act only applied to soldiers who were at the front. For he said they already had an Act relating to absentee voters which would apply to the case of others. That to which I wish to call his attention, and which I wish to emphasize, is that the New Zealand Act is intended to give to soldiers the opportunity to vote before they leave for the front; and it expressly provides that if they go to the front after the Act passes they must vote in New Zealand or they will not be permitted to vote at all. In that respect it is different from the present Bill, because this Bill provides that members of future contingents that leave for the front need not vote before they go—indeed there is no provision, as I understand it, for their marking their ballots before they go—but that while they are at the front, any Canadian commissioned officer whom the High Commissioner for Canada, Sir George Perley, chooses to appoint, may take the ballots to them, have them mark the ballots, make the necessary certificate and send the ballot back to the returning officer. In that respect this Bill is entirely different from the Bill which was submitted to the New Zealand Parliament. The quotation from the New Zealand Bill shows that in the opinion of that Government and that Parliament it was not desirable to give the vote to soldiers at the front engaged in actual warfare, but, they apparently thought that, because they were providing for soldiers who left in future registering their votes before they went away, ex necessitate but erroneously I think, that they must provide that those already abroad should be allowed to vote in the way proposed. Thereafter, however, any soldier who left for the front without marking his ballot before leaving the country could not be permitted to vote.

Now, I submit that we cannot with very great safety follow the example of New Zealand in this matter. We know that they have some other provisions of a most novel character in their election law, provisions which we have never sought to adopt in this country. They make provision, for instance, for the voter who is absent upon his ordinary business being allowed to vote. In this country we should not think of such a thing, because we realize that in carrying

on the elections here it is desirable to have safeguards surrounding the depositing of the ballot which could not be thrown around the recording of the votes of absentees. The Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) made the statement that we could safely follow New Zealand because it is a British country. But we are in the habit of following as far as we can the example of the Mother Country. The people of Canada realize that the example set by the Parliament of the Mother Country in most matters is a safe one to follow. It is a significant fact and one to which we should give great weight in dealing with this question that, though Great Britain has been engaged in many wars, yet never has it occurred to any one that it would be desirable to have a Bill passed by the British Parliament such as is now before this House. The Solicitor General said he doubted if there were any soldiers at the front in Britain's wars, who, if they had been in England would have had the right to vote. I doubt that statement very much. We know that it has been the glory of England that her young men of wealth, as well as those without wealth, have always been willing to go to the front. He knows that always many men of wealth who had commissions in the army have been ready to go to the front. It would seem to me most extraordinary if that statement of my hon. friend could be supported. The hon. gentleman said that during the Boer war the British Government had no thought of an election. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) called his attention to the fact that an election was held while the Boer war was in progress. Instead of answering the hon. member for Red Deer, the Solicitor General with that cleverness shall I say with that smartness—which I have sometimes seen in the police court when the police court lawyer turns and makes a flippant remark to the crowd of unwashed on the back benches to provoke laughter, said, "Well, you must not talk any more about not having elections during the war."

My hon. friend, instead of answering the hon. member for Red Deer, sought to turn the point in a flippant manner in order to provoke the laughter of his supporters. I do not think that that was very creditable on the part of the Solicitor General; I should have thought that he would answer the question of the hon. member for Red Deer. If there were any answer to be given, my hon. friend was capable of giving it; the only inference that we can draw is that no reasonable answer could be given.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and, I think, the Minister of Justice, referred to the fact that 50,000 Canadians are or soon will be fighting the battles of the Empire, and suggested that it would be outrageous if they should be compelled to make the sacrifice, in addition to risking their lives in the defence of their country, of losing the opportunity of voting in connection with questions which may affect the future government of this country. It has been pointed out that there is one way in which that condition need not be brought about. This Parliament will not have run its five years until very late in the autumn of 1916, and there can be one or even two sessions of Parliament before it will be necessary for the Government to go to the country. What question of great importance looms up to-day which would cause the Government to feel that they can properly advise His Royal Highness to cause this country to be plunged into the turmoil of an election contest? What reason is there why all these questions—questions respecting the navy; questions respecting the general administration of affairs; questions respecting the responsibilities for the scandals with which the atmosphere of the whole of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific is tainted—should be put before the people at this time? Is there any reason why this deplorable state of affairs should be brought about? Hon. gentlemen pretend that when we make suggestions of this kind, we are indicating that we fear to meet the electorate. Let me say to hon. gentlemen opposite that so far as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are concerned, our political success or failure is a matter of little importance to us as compared with the desirability, while this great war, which is shaking the Empire to its very foundations, is in progress, of not diverting the attention of the people from the serious questions relating to the war to the petty consideration of the triumph of one political party or the other. More than that, I believe that if hon. gentlemen, without reason save that of a desire to secure party triumph, throw this country into the turmoil of an election, that is the feeling which will be expressed by the people. In the session of August last, when Parliament was called for the purpose of considering measures which it was desirable to pass by reason of the war that had broken out, if the Government had then thought it de-

sirable to give the soldiers the right to vote, that was the time to have passed this legislation and to have made provisions, with proper safeguards, for the recording of the votes of the soldiers. In the various villages and towns where the soldiers were massed, opportunities could easily have been given for the marking of the ballots by the soldiers in the presence of scrutineers, and these ballots could have been kept, to be used when the election should take place. But the Government did not do that.

Mr. WILCOX: What about the soldiers who, having voted, were subsequently killed?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman asks a question which he might well ask of the Minister of Justice. Suppose many hundreds of soldiers are killed between the time they mark their ballots and the time the ballots reach the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; what would happen then?

Mr. WILCOX: Their votes would be counted.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then my hon. friend asserts that the votes of dead men would be counted.

Mr. DOHERTY: The votes counted would be the votes of men who had voted during the course of the election, not the votes of men who had voted months or years previous to the election.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That does not make any difference, because the Minister of Justice is providing not for voting for a particular person, but for voting for the Government or the Opposition, and the merits of either party might not change very much in the course of a few months—although, again, they might. I raised a question this afternoon when the Minister of Justice was speaking and I think it is a question which is worthy of consideration—as to the merits of the proposal to have soldiers vote while they are at the front. The casting of one's ballot is one of the most serious acts which a citizen can perform. It is a sacred right; it is also a sacred duty. To enable the elector to cast his vote intelligently and conscientiously, it is desirable that he should be informed upon the issues which are presented in the country. How is it possible for soldiers who have been for several months at the front, out of touch altogether with Canadian affairs, intelligently to vote upon the different questions which will necessarily influence the electorate when the election takes place? The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce told a Toronto audience the other night that they must remember that politics is not all boots and binoculars. Politics is not all boots and binoculars, yet the question of the scandals connected with the purchase of supplies for the war department, the question of the purchase of boots and binoculars and horses, the question of the employing of members of Parliament to make these purchases, the question of the excess prices which were charged—all these are matters which, to a large extent, will necessarily be considered by the electorate. What does a soldier at the front, who has been absent from the country for four or five months, know about these questions? It may be said: What does he care to know about them? Well, he will care to know about them if he wishes to cast his ballot in the best interests of his country and to perform his duty intelligently. I think it was the Minister of Justice who said that Lord Kitchener may be relied upon to prevent the soldiers from getting campaign literature. I do not know, however, that Lord Kitchener would be able to control that, if the partisan pamphlets were sent through the mails. I do not know that he would be aware of what kind of literature was being sent; besides I fancy that Lord Kitchener has something else to do. The officers who are at the front, Sir John French and others, have too much to do to pay attention to the letters or literature which might be sent to the soldiers. I am afraid that if this measure passes in its present form and the soldiers who are at the front are given the right to vote, you will find that at the time when all the best thought that a soldier can give to anything should be given to fighting the foe, there will be hostile camps among the soldiers, Liberal officers will be canvassing Liberal or Independent or wavering soldiers, and Conservative officers will be canvassing for their side, each endeavouring to explain to the soldiers his view of the issues which are before the people of Canada. Is that desirable? Of course that raises the whole question as to whether among the men who are at the front and whose first duty would be to devote all their time and attention to fighting in the interests of their country, it is desirable to introduce political contests and political partisanship and feeling. I do not see the same objection to

providing that soldiers who are going to the front shall be allowed to mark their ballot before they go. If the Bill had proposed to go only that far I would have been glad to support it and to give whatever aid I could towards perfecting the measure, towards surrounding the marking of the ballot of the soldier with every possible safeguard. But so far as those already gone are concerned, the Minister of Justice has lost the opportunity. Instead of bringing this measure in as I have said, in August, as he ought to have done if in the opinion of the Government it was desirable to pass a measure of this kind, he has waited until some 30,000 or more of our young men have gone to the front and he has lost the opportunity of giving them a reasonable and fair opportunity to cast their ballots. If, however, at this late date, the minister amends his Bill so that it will apply only to those who are hereafter to go to the front and give them an opportunity to mark their ballots before they go, then I will be heart and soul with him and will assist him in throwing safeguards around this measure, as I believe safeguards can easily be thrown around it. You can make provision and supply safeguards for soldiers voting in this country before they go to the front, but you cannot after they have gone to the front. Then too the same objection would not obtain as to introducing politics in the trenches. With soldiers voting here you can have scrutineers and proper arrangements made without great difficulty, and in that way I think there would be no complaint on the part of anybody. As my right hon. friend pointed out in those cases where the marking of the ballot is done in Canada you would have control over the officials whose duty it was to see that the ballots were properly marked, marked in secret and forwarded to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. All that could be provided for and persons who might commit violations of the law could be punished. But here you propose to send ballots to Belgium, France and, as my right hon. friend said, possibly even to Germany, to send ballots broadcast and place them in the hands of people who may commit wrong and who cannot be punished. You give an opportunity for the commission of any crime of forgery, any crime of substitution of ballots, outside of this country and by persons over whom the Canadian courts would have no jurisdiction. With reference to the franchise, as my right hon. friend in the unanswerable objection which he made to this Bill in its present form stated, this Bill gives a new franchise. It practically repeals the Provincial Franchise Act, under which the elections in Canada are held. The provincial Acts provide that a man must be resident in the province generally for a period of 12 months. This Bill provides that a man who happens to be a British subject, but who had lived previously in the United States, if he happened to be in Canada even while recruiting was going on, even while he was arranging to join the militia, even for 30 days, shall have the right to mark his ballot. What knowledge would a gentleman from the United States, who had come here to join the Canadian forces to fight for the Empire, have of the issues on which the Canadian people are divided? What reason is there in giving to those men who have not been citizens of Canada, who have not been permanent residents of Canada, who happen to have been in the country for 30 days, votes, when we deny them under ordinary circumstances to men whose residence has been as short as that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: How could such a man have a vote under this Bill when he had only been 30 days in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Every male British subject—

Mr. MEIGHEN: How would he get to be a British subject if he had only been in Canada for 30 days?

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the United States there are thousands of British subjects who have no interest in Canada whatever, but who have come to Canada, and they have been here 30 days before joining the Canadian forces, and have gone to serve the Empire. They go because they are British subjects. After the war is over they will go back to the United States. But what reason is there in giving to these men, who, even though they may be true British subjects, are strangers to Canada and strangers to the issues on which our people are divided, the right to decide as between the two parties, or to vote upon the issues which are dividing the Canadian people? The reason why the legislatures of the different provinces have required a considerable period of residence, is that a man who wants to cast his ballot may be interested in and informed upon Canadian questions, and may therefore vote intelligently on the issues before the people. In New Zealand there is no alteration in the franchise; no man can vote under the New Zealand Bill except a man who had a right to vote independently of that Bill altogether. It makes no change in the franchise, as this Bill does.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: It is a manhood franchise there.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Manhood franchise? But manhood franchise requires probably a certain period of residence in the country.

Mr. BENNETT: Registration only.

Mr. PUGSLEY: At all events, all provinces of Canada have required a certain period of residence in order to entitle a man to be registered as a voter. We have manhood suffrage in this country, and we require that there shall be a certain definite period of residence before a man may be registered as a voter.

For these reasons I am opposed to the Bill in its present form. I desire to be understood that, so far as I am concerned, I would support a measure which would provide that soldiers, before they leave Canada for the front, would be enabled to mark their ballots so that if an election came on during their absence the ballots would be cast by the returning officers under proper supervision. I would not have the Bill absolutely without safeguards as this Bill is; I would see that reasonable safeguards surrounded the voting. If that provision was made and the Bill was limited to that, I would feel that I could heartily support it; but in its present form I cannot support it. There is another objection to this Bill. Unlike the New Zealand Bill it is not limited to a general election. It is to be permanently attached to the Dominion Elections Act. It provides that ballots may be cast in a by-election, so that if at any time between now and the next general election there should be a by-election all this performance would have to be gone through, just as if it was a general election. I do not know whether the Government mean that, but that is one of the provisions of the Bill; and in that respect it differs most materially from the New Zealand Bill, which provides "that this Act shall be deemed to be repealed on the completion of the general election." This provision in regard to by-elections certainly seems to me to be contrary to reason, and on this ground alone, if on no other, the Bill ought not to commend itself to the House in its present form. I have the right to assume that when the Government brings down a Bill applying to by-elections as well as general elections, they mean what the Bill says. If they do not mean it, of course the Minister of Justice will tell us so; and no doubt the Bill will then be changed simply to meet the case of the general election.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT (Calgary): I was a member of the committee that was charged with the responsibility of preparing the Bill that is now submitted to the House. It does appear to me that the discussion that has taken place, during the last few moments at least, has overlooked the object for which that committee met, and the object that it had in view in endeavouring to provide votes for soldiers. The question it seems to me is a very simple one. Shall a portion of our population that is absent from Canada for a great cause be deprived of its franchise? Put in another way it is this: Shall thousands of our citizens who are exercising the highest obligation of citizenship be deprived of its highest privilege? In other words it is this: Shall those who are offering their lives as a willing sacrifice for us who remain at home be deprived of the right of expressing their view as to how we who remain conduct the affairs of our common country? Put in another way it is this: shall men who offer their lives for their country be punished by being deprived of their highest civil right? Now, considering these questions from any standpoint it seems to me there is only one answer; and in considering the answer that must be given to any one of these questions I submit that we must have regard to the constitutional conditions under which we live. No less a man than Lord Morley of Blackburn, in one of his admirable essays pointed out that it would never be possible for the residents or citizens of the overseas dominions to fight for Britain in a cause in which they had no special interest; and, strange as it may seem, he took as an illustration the possibility of citizens of overseas dominions fighting for the neutrality of Belgium. The very illustration that he took for what he said might not happen has happened; and today Canadians, New Zealanders, and Australians are fighting side by side with the regular troops of Great Britain for the maintenance of the neutrality and integrity of Belgium—a living demonstration of the lack of prophetic vision on the part of that great man.

Under our present constitutional system we had nothing to say directly as to whether we should engage in these hostilities. Our citizens who are offering their services are in no sense conscripts; they are under no obligation to render their service to the Empire. They are volunteers, and to that extent they are citizen soldiers, offering their ser-

9 p.m.

vices on the plains of Europe for the maintenance of a common democracy. That being so, the simple question is this: Shall citizen soldiers be deprived of the exercise of their civil rights, merely because as citizen soldiers they have offered their services on the fields of Europe? That was the question that was before the committee. We discussed it, and dealt with it from various standpoints, and there seemed to be in the mind of that committee but one answer to that question, and it was this: That a citizen of Canada, who is only a soldier by sentiment, by loyalty, by patriotism, and by a high regard for democracy and the cause of humanity, should not be deprived of the right to use his franchise merely because under extraordinary conditions he happens to be absent from this Dominion. I do not say that the committee was unanimous in arriving at that conclusion, but no member of it stood up and said: I say the principle is wrong. On the contrary every member of the committee felt that it was his bounden duty to give effect so far as it was possible, to the principle that a citizen of Canada who is absent from our shores under such extraordinary circumstances, and on so great and glorious a mission, should not be deprived of his civil rights. Having arrived at that conclusion, the next question that confronted the committee was: How shall we give effect to that conclusion? I will admit at once that it is not an easy thing to give effect to such a conclusion. That is the reason why the committee considered the matter at such length; that is the reason that they had recourse to precedents from other countries; that is the reason that they studied the legislation, for instance, of the States of the neighbouring republic; that is the reason that they studied the legislation of New Zealand. Why, Sir, during the last year there has been passed in many of the states of the United States legislation that will enable absentee voters to vote on election day, regardless of the cause on which they might be absent; and postal voting has been established in some of the King's Dominions, not in the republic to the south of us but in the King's Dominions, the principle being that mere temporary absence from the country should not deprive a man of the exercise of his franchise. No hon. gentleman opposite will deny that the whole trend of legislation to-day, so far as the exercise of the franchise is concerned, is to make possible the exercise of that franchise by every man who is entitled to exercise it under the laws of the country in which he lives. That is the whole trend of democratic legislation. If you look at the last American Year Book, to which I had occasion to direct the attention of the committee during the discussion of this measure, you will find that in various states provision is being made to meet that very point; namely, that some provision should be made whereby the man who has a right to vote, but who is temporarily absent on election day, should be able to declare whether he favours or opposes particular Bills, or parties, or governments, or legislation. That being so, we endeavoured to find some method by which a well-recognized principle of democracy might be maintained in all its strength, and whereby our fellow Canadians not temporarily absent in the ordinary sense of the term, but absent for the greatest cause for which Canadians have ever gone away, should be given every chance of sharing in the Government of this country. That is all.

What do we propose? First of all we propose that every British subject of the age of 21 years shall have a vote. Why? It is the universal law in this Dominion that every British subject of the age of 21 years shall have a vote. In Ontario, Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, British Columbia, Quebec, in all the provinces, the same provision applies. Instead of making a new franchise we are endeavouring to recognize the fact that in each of the provinces men of that type have votes, and because of the fact that this legislation is for a Dominion franchise, we made the broad declaration that every British subject of the age of 21 years shall have a vote.

My hon. and learned friend from St. John has just directed attention to the fact that there is an extraordinary provision in the Bill whereby residence of a British subject for thirty days prior to enlistment shall constitute residence necessary to vote, and he directed attention to the fact that in the New Zealand Bill no such provision appears. Surely my hon. friend is not serious?

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I said was that in the New Zealand Bill the franchise was not altered in regard to residence.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend did hardly say that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: He went a step further. What does section 2 of the New Zealand Act say? It says:

Every member of any expeditionary force sent from New Zealand to serve in the war in which His Majesty is at present engaged, shall be entitled to vote.

I do not attach any importance to what they do in New Zealand. It is merely a precedent, because there happened to be a general election. It became necessary to preserve the rights of the citizens to vote and in order to preserve that right they passed that legislation, but I do not attach any importance to what they have done in New Zealand in so far as Canada is concerned. The problem we had to deal with was a problem of our own and we only refer to New Zealand in so far as its action throws any light upon the question. It is merely referred to by the Government as showing what others have done. We have different conditions.

We have endeavoured to preserve the provincial franchise. We felt that any man who is a subject of the King and Emperor, who had come to this country and resided in it for thirty days, who would ordinarily have acquired the franchise and who, instead of extending his residence for three months or six months or twelve months, was still in theory a Canadian citizen while serving under the colours in Flanders or in France, should have the vote. We provided that if he had been for thirty days in Canada he should have a vote provided that if that man had a vote in any other portion of Canada he should vote just where he had that vote in accordance with the provincial list and not otherwise. We have made no new franchise, we have endeavoured to substitute no new Act for the existing Acts, but we merely say that we will recognize existing rights. The provincial franchise must be exercised. But the committee felt that a British subject who had lived thirty days in Canada, although having his residence insofar as the fact is concerned with the colours in France or Belgium, should be given the franchise. At one time we discussed the possibility of preparing a list, but many difficulties were pointed out, and that idea was abandoned. Then the committee submit to Parliament a measure by which they say: We shall send ballots forward for the purpose of enabling our citizen soldiers to express their will at the polls. If you admit that we should answer the question as to whether they should have a vote in the affirmative, and if it be answered in the affirmative, and that we should preserve as far as possible the existing franchise, the next thing to be done was to see that they exercise that franchise under proper safeguards. That was discussed, and it was concluded to adopt the very simple method provided by the Bill. It is proposed that we shall prepare the ballots and send them forward. They will be distributed among the men, they will be placed in an envelope with an affidavit, because we must have some safeguards. This envelope will be sent back to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will send the envelopes to the various electoral districts where the ballots will be counted. We felt that there should be legislation to provide against the very difficulty that the Minister of Justice has pointed out, namely, uncertainty as to the result of the elections. We said that if these ballots reached the returning officer after the polling day they should not be counted. We felt that the uncertainty that prevailed in New Zealand in consequence of the manner in which the soldiers' votes had been transmitted after they had been cast in Egypt and Samoa caused a great deal of difficulty and we said that if the votes of the soldiers reached the returning officers in the various constituencies in Canada after the day of election they should not be counted. Then we provided that some time during election day, but after the close of the poll, so as to obviate the possibility of there being some knowledge in the mind of the electors as to how the poll was going, these ballots should be counted and placed in the ballot box and added to the general results. I do submit that that is fair, that it is a recognition of the obligation on the part of the Canadian people and Parliament assembled to give some countenance and support to the very proper claim that was made by the soldiers that went from my constituency to myself that they should be enabled to cast their votes if a general election should happen during their absence, and that they should not be obliged to lose their civil rights because they exercised the higher obligations of citizenship.

What complaint can be urged against that? Two complaints are urged against it. One is that it opens the way to fraud, and another is that you have not the safeguards that should surround the exercise of the franchise. Living as I do in western Canada all I can say is that under the legislation we have before us Canada's soldiers cannot do anything in the way of fraud comparable with what I have seen. I am not saying that in a cavilling spirit. That happened in the last general election in the province of Alberta? In one constituency

the ballot box was opened and the votes taken out and to this day the offender has not been punished. Would you sooner trust the British officer, one of our fellow Canadian officers, who has before him the grim responsibilities of his position with death staring him in the face, to do the decent, honest thing, or would you rather trust a returning officer where a ballot box was opened, as in Medicine Hat last election? Which would you rather have, which would the people of Canada sooner have, which would any reasonable man sooner have?

Then my hon. friend goes a step further and he says: Why, surely, you would not permit a British subject who has come in from the United States and has only been thirty days in Canada to vote in Canada? Oh, no! Come with me to the province of Saskatchewan. At the last general election you could have seen thousands of aliens voting as they were told. And that is not all. Come with me to any poll in the province of Alberta where we have naturalized Germans and Austrians and tell me whether you would prefer the vote of a British subject who lived thirty days in Canada to that of the naturalized alien whose instincts and sympathies are still with what he calls his fatherland.

Come with me and tell me whether or not you would sooner trust the Briton who has lived thirty days in Canada than the authors of the splendid pamphlet that I hold in my hand that is now printed on one side in German and on the other in English upon a printing press controlled, I believe, by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), commending: Canada first; down with participation by Canadians in the wars of the Empire; preserve Canada for the Germans and the Austrians and all those other foreign people who come here and make it their home; but never mind Britain, because she and her King can take care of themselves. Would you trust those naturalized foreigners or would you trust the thirty-day resident British subject who came from the United States in order that he might offer his life as a sacrifice for your safety and mine? I commend my hon. friend from the old loyalist city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) to go back and ask his electors whether they would prefer to see the franchise for this great Dominion of Canada exercised by the men who had journeyed over from Massachusetts or Vermont or Maine and lived here for thirty days that they might fight for our country and Empire or the men I have mentioned. Let him go and ask the descendants of the founders of St. John. I leave it to the electorate of St. John to deal with my hon. friend as they will.

After dealing with that as I have stated and after having arrived at the conclusions which I have mentioned, we found it necessary to surround the franchise with such safeguards as we could suggest, and I think the safeguards in the Bill are adequate for the purposes intended. In the province in which I live all that is necessary for a man to do to exercise his franchise is this: He walks into a polling booth and the returning officer says: "What is your name?" "John Jones." "Where do you live?" "Well, just west of Edmonton," or "just west of Calgary." "Where?" "Oh, not far from Edson," or "not far from Morley." "Well, your name is not on the list." "That is all right, partner; let's swear." That is the way the thing goes on. The man puts his hand upon the Bible, and he swears that he is a British subject; that he is 21 years of age, and that he has resided one year in the province of Alberta and three months in a particular electoral district. He gets the ballot; goes out; fills it up; comes in and puts it into the ballot box, and you may seek in vain for John Jones next day. The place that knows him knows him no more, and the place that knew him knows him no more. Yet you are going to tell me that the 12,000 electors from the Province of Alberta that are now fighting or getting ready to fight for this Empire, some in Europe and some in England and some in Canada, cannot vote, but that this John Jones can vote. Out in yonder trenches the man goes up and swears an affidavit before his commanding officer, and we have the record of that man from now until the time that he is discharged or until he offers his life for his country. His name is there; it is enrolled upon the records; we know him for all time; his history will be the common heritage of us all. We know that man, but who knows anything of John Jones who came in on the train and put up at a hotel? Yet he must vote, but my friends from Calgary cannot vote; my hon. friend's friends from Edmonton cannot vote. Why? Because my hon. friends opposite say that there are not sufficient safeguards when the soldier makes his affidavit. He marks his ballot and next morning perhaps he is offering his life for his country. His ballot is put into an envelope and sent back, but it cannot be counted because there are no safeguards! I am sure my hon. friend from Edmonton

will not support any such doctrine as that which my hon. friend from St. John advocates. I am sure he will not permit himself for a single moment to go back on his old and tried and true friends who are now fighting in Europe and who would like to have a chance to vote, any more than I shall go back on those who have voted both for and against me and who in the trenches have a desire to vote. The safeguards which are thrown around the voting by the men in the trenches are better than the safeguards as regards voting in the province of Saskatchewan or of Alberta are to-day or to-morrow.

Oh, my hon. friends perhaps will say: It is going to interfere with military operations and Lord Kitchener will veto the measure. In any event, it will not be Lord Kitchener that will veto the measure; it will be Sir John French or whoever is in command of the British forces. Assuming, however, that by virtue of military exigencies and necessities, our soldiers cannot vote, does that lessen the obligation of their fellow-Canadians to give them the right to vote if they want to? I do not for a single moment say that our soldiers will vote, but I know that some of them want to vote. I do not say that they will have the opportunity to exercise the franchise that they would like to have, because it may be that the military exigencies and necessities of the war will prevent them from doing so; but I would be recreant to my duties and this House would be recreant to its duties and to the trust reposed in it by its Canadian fellow-citizens thousands of miles from here, if we did not afford them the opportunity to vote if they wish to do so. When men tell me that some one is going to veto something or that something is going to interfere with something else, that does not interfere with or lessen the right of this Parliament to do its plain and obvious duty. I do not for a single moment doubt that if an election came at a certain date, there might be great difficulties; but we have not said on what day the soldiers shall vote. As soon as it is known there is going to be an election, the ballots will be transmitted to Europe and circulated, and although it may be that some of the soldiers will say: I am not going to be bothered about an election, and they will throw the ballot away, there may be ten men out of a company of a hundred who want to vote. I intend to use such power and influence as I have to give those ten men the right to exercise the franchise if they so desire. Why should there be any magnifying of the seriousness of the situation? Why should there not be a common desire on the part of this Parliament on both sides—Government and Opposition—to say: We are going to give the men an opportunity to vote, and we will make this measure as perfect as possible. When I think of the labyrinths of the mind of my hon. friend from St. John, I am sure he can devise safeguards to throw around this voting, and may I say that with his large experience and great knowledge of the law, it would be his manifest duty, as coming from the old loyalist city of St. John, when we are sitting here in committee, to give that splendid talent of his to make perfect this measure and to see that his fellow-citizens shall have the right to vote if they so desire. This is not a provocative nor a contentious measure; this Bill enanated from the committee as quite the opposite and we discussed it in the most friendly and amicable manner possible. Some hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is absolutely impossible to carry this legislation into effect. I say nothing is impossible to a Parliament that desires to achieve a given result or end, and although the measure may not be as perfect as it should be, that does not deter me from using my influence to have something placed upon the statute-book that will make possible the end which we have in mind and which should be effective. My hon. friend says: I am in favour of letting the soldiers in the country have a vote, but once they go out of the country, I am not. Is a soldier who is garrisoned at Halifax who comes from Alberta in any better position than a soldier who comes from Calgary who is garrisoned at Bermuda? Is a soldier who came from Edmonton and is now garrisoned at, let us say, Winnipeg, in any better position than the soldier who came from Edmonton and is now garrisoned at Alexandria, Egypt, or on Salisbury Plain or in Tidworth barracks?

If we admit that, let us go a step further. Is such a soldier in any worse position if he happens to be with the second division, or brigaded with certain British regiments at some point in France? You say: the difficulties are multiplied because these men are in the trenches, but men do not stay in the trenches all the time; they go to their base. Suppose there are two hundred of them—a double company with a major in charge, the major sees to it that these two hundred men are handed their ballots. In due course each makes his affidavit before the commissioned officer who is authorized

to administer the oath, and the ballot is put in an envelope, the officer certifying that the man entitled to vote had actually marked that ballot. That ballot comes out to Canada and in due course finds its way to Calgary. Is there any difficulty about that? Why magnify these difficulties and go into mock heroics about the dangers of the trenches? Why discuss these sanguinary differences between two contending armies, when the vote is not being cast there at all? Why not look at this reasonably as practical men? It does seem to me it is possible to be done. Why innoculate this discussion with talk about scandals in boots?

If this Government were desirous of covering alleged scandal about improper equipment, do you suppose they would be so anxious that the men who wear the boots should have the vote? If this terrible condition exists that the hon. member for St. John city imagines—and it is pure imagination—does he think for a moment that the soldier wearing paper upon his feet instead of boots would vote for the Government? You would think the hon. gentleman would almost exhaust his energy in giving that soldier the right to vote. Either the hon. gentleman does not believe the boots are bad, or else there is something else behind all this to cause him to prevent the soldier from having the vote. What is it? Why does the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) desire that the soldiers should not have the vote? Why does the hon. member for St. John city take the same view? Why do hon. gentlemen opposite generally offer such opposition to this legislation? It must be that they remember that the soldiers have memories. It must be that they recollect that the men who are fighting for Canada at this time bear in mind the political history of their country. Their knowledge and recollection will induce them to mete out to the right hon. gentleman and those who sit beside him that measure of justice which these recollections would entail. No doubt some of these gallant soldiers in the trenches have read the utterances of some of the hon. gentlemen opposite. They cannot fail to have taken note of the noble sentences that decry British diplomacy and look forward with joy to the day when, so far as Canada is concerned, it shall be no more. They cannot fail to remember having read in text books of elections in this country that Canadians would never fight for Britain in Britain's wars, Canada not being interested. Remembering these sentences that have fallen from the lips of stalwart leaders of their party, peradventure, these hon. gentlemen opposite think: If we give these men the vote, they may remember this against us. I wonder if that is the reason. Far be it from me to suggest that to be the reason, because I know that hon. gentlemen opposite are dominated by a higher spirit of patriotism than that. There must be another reason. I fain would know it. But, after having listened to the speech of the right hon. leader of the Opposition and of that great legal luminary who sits to his right, I fail, absolutely fail, to ascertain that reason. There is a mystery about it, and I would like to see that mystery solved. No doubt many other people in Canada would like to see it solved. Why should a simple little Bill that offers our fellow-Canadians the franchise cause all this trouble? One would think that hon. gentlemen opposite would be falling over one another in their support of this measure. Their statements will be read in the morning with great pain, and I am sure it will cause many an anxious moment to Liberals in the country that I come from when they find that their brothers are denied the franchise by the acts of hon. gentlemen opposite. And many a wife who has given her husband to the war will sorrow and be exceeding sad to know that her husband, because he is in France fighting for Canada, cannot vote in the next election. I wonder how the hon. member for Edmonton is going to feel when these two thousand men from his constitutency learn that he voted against this measure. I cannot understand hon. gentlemen opposite to-night. Their conduct is really passing strange. And I do not think anybody will be able to understand on what principle they have arrived at such conclusions as they have expressed here. They talk about boot scandals, and yet they will not trust the soldiers to judge their own boots. They talk about horse scandals, but the only horse I have seen ridden around here is one that, I think, will not accomplish much—the scandal horse. They are disappointed because the Government has called for a full inquiry; because there is no blockers' brigade, because there is no dark lantern brigade; and, to fill up their cup of bitterenss—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman is not confining himself closely to the Bill under discussion.

Mr. BENNETT: Possibly I have wandered far from the subject because the hon. member for St. John city was discussing scandal, and, as he is an expert in that matter, I wished to remind him of certain things. I had almost thought that perhaps the soldiers would remember the sawdust wharves and other things of that sort.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is thoroughly non-partisan.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman says the wharf is non-partisan. In that, I think, he is altogether right. The committee in the preparation of this Bill did not have in mind an immediate election, and that I can say with all certainty. The hon. and learned gentleman who presided over the committee, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), brought to bear upon the measure every consideration he could to make it fair and workable, and the other members of the committee did not prepare the Bill with regard to an immediate election. The hon. member for Red Deer said that this measure emanated from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). If all the work of the Minister of Public Works is as good as this—and I do not think he appeared before the committee—he has every reason to be proud of his handiwork in trying to give his fellow-Canadians at the front a chance to exercise the franchise. The committee had regard to what had been done in other colonies and dominions. Members may not have been altogether forgetful of the fact that challenges had been issued from the other side as to the possibility of an election. After these challenges I received letters from soldiers from my own constituency who were leaving for the front and from those who had already left, pointing out that it was said we were going to have a general election.

They had heard that the Opposition had said that we dare not have an election, and they expressed a desire to have an opportunity of recording their votes. I do not doubt that they desired to have a vote in order to vote against the party that dared challenge us to have an election at this time. All I have to say to the hon. member for Red Deer, when he talks in high-flown and heroic terms about an election at this time, is that if he would make an attempt to have his own party refrain from making challenges about elections and from talking about elections and appeals to the people, he would be accomplishing a great deal more than he is doing by offering his advice as to whether or not we should have one, while at the same time sending out ammunition in the shape of campaign literature. In my town that ammunition is all in shape, ready to burst the moment the word is given. This partisan shell has a time fuse; just what time has been fixed, I do not know, but it is ready to be exploded at the proper time. A friend of mine, writing to me the other day, told me all about this. Our people have not any of this campaign ammunition in readiness, so far as I know; perhaps we do not need any.

I have pointed out the considerations that influenced the committee in endeavouring to arrive at a conclusion in this matter, and I have pointed out the safeguards with which we have endeavoured to surround the exercising of the franchise under the conditions proposed. I am not unmindful of the fact that any election law that may be placed on the statute book can be circumvented and broken by crooks, but it remains for hon. gentlemen opposite to insinuate that the officers who are offering their lives, and who may face death the next day, are going to do a fraudulent, dishonest and dishonourable thing in giving effect to this legislation. I do not believe it, and I do appeal to the members on the other side of this House for once to forget partisanship, provocativeness and contentiousness, and to unite with us in putting upon the Statute Book a measure of which Canada may be proud. It is not enough that those who go to the front to fight for us should make us proud of them; we who remain behind to legislate and to deal with the great problems which surround us every day should make these men, when they come back from the trenches, proud of us. I do not believe that Canadians should be deprived of the privilege of exercising their civil rights merely because freely, voluntarily, without conscription, without restraint, without coercion, without in any sense being requested or asked so to do by legal authority, they have offered their services to their King and Empire. Twelve thousand soldiers from the province of Alberta ask that this measure of justice shall be given them. Twelve thousand men, their brothers and sisters, their wives and other relatives, ask that this measure of justice shall be given them. Even if the legislation is not surrounded by all the safeguards that you would wish, they ask that we place upon the statute book something which will enable the men who are offering their lives as a sacrifice to-day to exercise their rights,

for or against this Government. Let us do this thing, in the name of justice, of equity, of fair play, of that righteousness which exalteth a nation, of that spirit which pervades those who are offering their lives as sacrifices for us. That is what animated the committee, and the legislation, I do submit, is as fair and reasonable as it possibly could be, having regard to the circumstances and to the difficulty of the task which the committee undertook to perform.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I am sure that if there had been any doubt in the minds of hon. gentlemen of the House as to the character and purpose of this Bill, the speech of our hon. friend has set that doubt at rest. We understand now beyond any question that this is a political measure, for partisan purposes, and for partisan purposes only. I do not wish at the moment to follow my hon. friend in the course of his devious remarks. I shall confine myself rather to the argument that preceded his. I wish at first to draw attention to the difference that exists between the conditions surrounding the bringing forward of the New Zealand Bill and those surrounding the bringing forward of this proposed legislation. I wish to point out that there is no comparison between the conditions surrounding these two Bills. In the case of the New Zealand Bill, an election was compelled in the immediate future by effluxion of time; in the case of this Bill, no election is compelled in the immediate future by effluxion of time. There was a definite reason why the New Zealand legislature should take some action in regard to the votes of soldiers; there is no reason why this Government at this time should take such action, unless it be the intention of the Government to bring on a general election during the course of this war for the purpose of enabling its followers to make addresses throughout the Dominion of Canada of the kind and character that my hon. friend has just favoured us with. If the right hon. the Prime Minister calls a general election and turns his followers loose on the platforms of this country with such talk as my hon. friend has engaged in here to-night, how far is that going to urge Canada to do her full share in the matter of rendering assistance to the Empire during the course of this war? I ask the Prime Minister whether, if Canada is to do her part, this is not a time when Canadians should be united; when there should be as few differences introduced into the public mind as possible? We are bound to assume, from what we have heard to-night, that he has it in mind, without cause or justification, except the probability of securing a partisan advantage, to throw a general election upon the country and to set Canadians against each other—as my hon. friend the hon. member for Calgary has himself said; against me and against my friends—at a time when men should be looking forward only in one direction, and that to the giving of whatever assistance they can to the Empire.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should like to say to my hon. friend, since he has appealed to me, that the question of a general election will stand on its own merits when the time comes. There has been no decision either to hold an election or not to hold an election; we have been too busy with other things. But I desire to tell him this: that, including the vote of want of confidence which his leader moved and which he supported, in their every move during the past six weeks in this House, hon. gentlemen on the other side have been actuated purely by a desire to obtain partisan advantage at the expense of that unity which the hon. gentleman so greatly lauds at the present time. Any man who has followed the course taken by hon. gentlemen in this House and in the committees of this House during the past six weeks, knows absolutely the truth of what I have just said.

Mr. GRAHAM: We do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. OLIVER: I may be permitted to deviate for a moment from the course of my remarks to follow what the Prime Minister said. The only occasion on which the course of the Government has been challenged in this House at this session was on the occasion of the Budget, on the occasion of a reversal of the fiscal policy of Canada; and I ask him if he considers that in a country under representative institutions and under responsible Government, if we held views different from those advocated by himself, we would have been doing our duty to the country if we had done less than we did. I cannot imagine that unless my hon. friend is taking the position that he has been elected the Czar of Canada—

Mr. GRAHAM: The Kaiser.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg pardon; yes, the Kaiser, and that there must be no differ-

ence of opinion and no expression of any difference of opinion when once the mind of the Government has been made up. If that is the condition it is most extraordinary, and I for one had never understood that to be the position, even as the Prime Minister himself understood it or ever thought of enforcing it upon the country. I would say this to him, if I may be permitted, that if he thinks that the excuses he has given here to-night will excuse him before the people of Canada if he throws this country into the turmoil of a general election when he does not need to while this war is on, he mistakes the opinion of the people of this country and mistakes it very seriously. However, from what has passed here to-day, while the Prime Minister has said that he has not decided yet to hold a general election, we are bound to assume from what he has said that a general election while the war is on is entirely within the range of possibility or even of probability; and I am entitled then to conclude that this legislation is introduced distinctly with that object in view.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: That it is, in its nature and essentially, partisan legislation introduced for a partisan purpose in order to further the interest of purely party politics.

Let me say further in regard to the New Zealand case, where provision is made for the taking of a vote for the election of members of the Legislaure and where the vote is not cast for the individual member, but cast for or against the Government or the Opposition or Labour party. But there was another vote provided for, a vote on the great question of prohibition. Provision is made for the taking of a vote on prohibition at the same time as the vote on the general election. It was necessary, I understand, under the arrangement that had been made that these two votes should be taken at the same time. I am prepared to argue that instead of the Dominion of New Zealand providing as they did for the taking of the vote of soldiers during their absence from the country for the sake of getting the soldiers' vote, they made the provision for the purpose of getting the definite opinion of the people of New Zealand in regard to the question and principle of prohibition; and that if it had not been for the submission of the question of prohibition there is no reason to believe that the Government of New Zealand would have made a provision that would have called for a declaration on the part of a voter that he votes for or against the Government as an exercise of his franchise; because it is not an exercise of his franchise. I think the difference in these two points is sufficiently important to emphasize, first that the vote in New Zealand was primarily ordered for the purpose of deciding the prohibition question, a question that had not to do with men but only with principles and, secondly, that the election had to be held. In the case of Canada the election does not have to be held for another period of about 18 months. There is this further difference, that New Zealand is a small country with a comparatively small population, a compact country with a compact people of like race and language and interests and ideas from end to end of the dominion. It is more reasonable that the voters of New Zealand should satisfy their aspirations as to the expression of their political views by voting merely for or against the Government or Labour party than that this should be done by the people of the Dominion of Canada, spread over the width of a continent, of many different provinces, including many different races of people and many different conditions of life. There is no way that the elector of the Dominion of Canada can express his views in regard to the government of this country to the satisfaction of his aspirations in controlling the affairs of the country unless he votes for a man, unless he votes for somebody as well as for something; and when the hon. the Minister of Justice or the other members of the House who have spoken in support of this Bill, suggest that by the passing of this Bill they are giving to our soldiers who are or will be in Europe the opportunity to exercise their franchise on an equality with their fellow-citizens in Canada, they are simply stating what is absurd on its face. It is not, however, in regard to that feature of the voting that I wish to speak. It is not the provision for the voting of the soldier who is in Europe that I wish to criticise; it is the provision for the voting of the soldier who is in Canada. The other feature of the question has been already very fully dealt with. I find that in this Bill the soldier who is still in Canada, who surely should be entitled to exercise his franchise just as any other citizen of Canada, and should have the same safeguards thrown around the exercise of that franchise, is compelled to cast his vote just as the soldier who is in Europe. He does not vote for a candi-

date, he votes for the Government or for the Opposition as the case may be, although he is living right in Canada, and his vote must run the gauntlet of people holding the same view in regard to election proceedings, as my hon. friend from Calgary has told us, are so numerous in Western Canada. The fact that these people—for they are the same people—are in uniform does not necessarily change their character or their intentions or their views, but it does in a large measure give them immunity from those restrictions, or, in case of necessity, immunity from those penalties, to which civilians acting in the same way would be subject.

My hon. friend from Calgary has alluded to the fact that there are 2,000 soldiers in barracks in or near the city of Edmonton with whom I shall have to reckon when election day comes. I shall be glad to reckon with these 2,000 soldiers, as I certainly will have to, if I could be sure that when these men vote they will vote on election day, and vote for candidates that are offering in the several constituencies, and that their votes will be taken by officials, who will be subject to the ordinary procedure of the courts and not enjoy immunity in any degree, as they certainly will under the provisions of this Act. In other words, I want the 2,000 men to vote, but I want to be sure that their votes will be counted the way they want them to be counted; and I am not sure of that under the terms of this Bill. I want to say—and if I go outside the rules, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will check me—I say, on the statement of the hon. member for Calgary, and on the statement that I have given here to-night, that this Bill is for the purpose of stealing the election, and that that is all it is for. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether this Government has the right to turn 2,000 voters loose in my constituency without proper check as to scrutineers, as to qualifications, or as to any other restrictions except what are contained in this Act? I say that it is a piece of electoral villainy that has been planned and produced in this Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. member that it is not permissible for a member to impute improper motives. No rule is more clear than that, according to the rulings of both English and Canadian speakers.

Mr. OLIVER: I desire to bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and beg to withdraw the assertion unreservedly. I have no doubt that I trespassed on the rules of Parliament, although I was speaking according to my own belief, and I think quite within the actual facts of the case. That is the condition prevailing under this Bill as it applies to the case to which my hon. friend from Calgary has himself alluded. My hon. friend from Calgary has in effect threatened me here in this House with what will happen to me at the hands of these men if I dare to oppose this Bill. Mr. Speaker, there have been some strange things done in the Parliament of Canada; there have been some strange things done in Canadian politics; but I venture to say that no stranger thing has been done than the production of a Bill such as this, backed by a threat such as that. I agree that every citizen of Canada who is entitled to vote should vote whenever and wherever the opportunity can be given or found that will ensure that his vote, when given, shall be counted as he intended it to be counted; and if the Minister of Justice will produce a Bill that will give our Canadian citizens in France or in Flanders or in Germany or wherever they please, the right to express their views and to cast their votes for the candidates standing in the Dominion election, and if provision is made that that vote when cast shall be counted as it was intended to be counted, that Bill will have my hearty support. I do not object to the voting of the soldiers; but I object to the counting by the Government. I say that it is—well, I will not say what I was going to say, but I say that if the soldiers are to mark their ballots in Belgium and our friends here in Ottawa are to count them without any more restrictions or provisions for an honest count than are contained in this Bill, the soldiers will certainly not be getting what some of the speakers here to-night have held out as being given to them. I am not going to tell the House, for my hon. friend from Calgary has told us to-night how corrupt are the election transactions in the province that he and I come from, and how much more corrupt they are in other provinces. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to take the hon. gentleman at his word. Only take him at his word, and then read the provisions of this Bill, and say what chance there would be for the man who voted in Flanders of having his vote counted against the Government in Canada. Why, this Bill is an inspiration! Fifty thousand votes to be collected and distributed throughout the various constituencies of Canada wherever they will do the most good! The possibilities are magnifi-

10 p.m.

cent,, and no doubt they appeal to the brilliant imagination of my hon. friend from Calgary. I could easily imagine how industriously he worked on the terms of this Bill when I heard how enthusiastically he supported its provisions. Why, there would be nothing to an election with a Bill such as this in the hands of the Government. Will I deny that the electoral proceedings in my hon. friend's constituency are as corrupt as he said they were?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman is mistaken. It was a Liberal returning officer, under the auspices of a Liberal Government, that opened this ballot box, not in the constituency of Calgary but in the adjoining one of Medicine Hat.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to put on a variety entertainment in this House, following the lead of my hon. friend from Calgary, but I may say for the information of the House, seeing that he has been so very personal, that I was informed by the gentleman who had charge of the Liberal side of the campaign that, after my hon. friend was elected to this House from the constituency of Calgary, they sent out letters to 2,500 addresses on the voters' list, persons who had presumably supported my hon. friend, and they never got any replies.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The lists were prepared by the Liberals.

Mr. BLAIN: What was the majority?

Mr. BENNETT: The majority was 3,000.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend knows whereof he speaks when he speaks of electoral corruption in Alberta.

Mr. BENNETT: No man has suffered more from it than myself.

Mr. OLIVER: I think that after hearing my hon. friend the House will bear me out when I make the suggestion that the hon. gentleman has suffered more from himself than from anybody else. My hon. friend made allusion to a paper which he held up and which he intimated was printed on a press owned and controlled by myself. It does not make any difference to the House, I presume, whether I owned or controlled the press or not, but for the information of the House I may say that I do not own or control the press nor have I had any control over it for some months past. I did have some interest in a German paper published in Edmonton, and I think my hon. friend had an interest in a German paper published in Calgary.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No.

Mr. OLIVER: I understood he had, but that the finanical results were something like the financial results in Edmonton, and that ultimately the connection ceased. It certainly did in my case, and I presume it was the same in his.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That is right. It was a Liberal paper in which I had $200 worth of stock, subscribed under misrepresentation and I lost every dollar.

Mr. OLIVER: So I lost mine.

Mr. BENNETT: The honours are easy.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. I have laid the burden of establishing the position of the Government on the speech which the hon. member for Calgary delivered to the House. I am sorry I cannot restrict my allusions to the hon. member for Calgary. I said in the beginning of my remarks that this Bill was evidently intended as a partisan measure, introduced with a view to an impending election and that it was brought forward by the Government for the express purpose of unduly and improperly affecting that election. Is this Government above suspicion in matters of that kind? Is it unfair to make such a suggestion? I see that my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. Clark) nods his head. Does he say it is?

Mr. HUGH CLARK: I am curious to know whether the hon. member thinks that the ballots that are marked in Flanders, in France, or in Germany will not be counted properly.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend from Calgary has complained vociferously in regard to the mishandling of ballots in elections and I say that these same people will be the people who will handle the counting of the ballots from Flanders. I have no more reason to believe that that count will go straight than the count that my hon. friend has spoken of, assuming that what he said was true.

Mr. H. CLARK: He was speaking of elections controlled by Liberals.

Mr. OLIVER: That brings me about where I wanted to get. This election is being controlled by Conservatives, it is being controlled by this Government, and inasmuch as it is going to be controlled by this Government, it is going to be a square election and these men are going to have their ballots counted properly—is that what I am to understand?

Mr. H. CLARK: That is it.

Mr. OLIVER: What have we before the country to lead us to believe that the country is going to get a square deal at the hands of this Government?

Mr. H. CLARK: It will be controlled by British officers.

Mr. OLIVER: By what officers?

Mr. H. CLARK: British officers.

Mr. OLIVER: If my hon. friend will show me something in the Bill to say that it will not be controlled by Canadian officers perhaps there may be something in his argument, but we heard to-day that it was to be controlled by Canadian officers, and certainly it is only reasonable that it should be Canadian officers. I do not know that Canadian officers change their character very much because they become officers or because they are resident in Flanders instead of Canada. I am only taking the case as the hon. member for Calgary has put it. My hon. friend from Bruce must settle it with the hon. member for Calgary if he has any fault to find with my remarks. What right has this country to expect a square deal at elections or in anything at the hands of this Government? If this Government and party on the other side have any principle which they stand by, which they vociferate, it is the principle of loyalty to Britain. Is that right? How have they shown their loyalty to Britain? They have borrowed $50,000,000 from Britain for the purposes of war. What have they done with it? How have they used it? As soon as Parliament rose in August last, from end to end of Canada, the evidence is plain, their jackalls were turned loose, they were told to "go to it."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is forgetting that it is the principle of this Bill that is under consideration at present.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend from Bruce asked me a question. I was desirous of elaborating the point, and I wanted to show why the Government could not be trusted to count these ballots honestly. If I may proceed with all moderation; from the purchase of motor trucks to the purchase of hospital supplies, it is on the records that there has been nothing but graft and corruption from beginning to end. Is that loyalty? That is the kind of patriotism we are getting at the hands of this Government; that is the kind of honesty that we have been getting at the hands of this Government. If this Government cannot be trusted to buy bandages for sick soldiers at an honest price and of an honest quality, can they be trusted to count the votes cast in Flanders? I think not. If they cannot be trusted to buy boots that will keep the soldiers in fair condition, if their manufacturers supply leather doubled in order to make it strong instead of honest single leather; if they are able to charge from thirty cents to fifty cents per pair more for the boots supplied than they are worth, according to sworn evidence, and if the Government allows them to do that, is that the Government that is going to give us an honest count of these ballots? I say, no, and we do not expect it. The Government who sent their members of Parliament out to buy horses are the honest patriots who are going to count the votes of the soldiers in Flanders.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to say that the hon. member is offending against the rules in two particulars. One is that he is not discussing the principle of this Bill, and the other is that he is referring to matters in committee which are not reported to this House, and therefore cannot properly be referred to in this House.

Mr. OLIVER: I have concluded my remarks, and I beg to apologize for having offended.

Mr. WILLIAM F. NICKLE (Kingston): At this particular time I doubt if I should have made any remarks upon the principle of this measure, had it not been for the extreme, and to me as an easterner, the violent language of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver).

Mr. OLIVER: Might I ask if the hon. member was offended by the language used by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett)?

Mr. NICKLE: To one coming from the East, that an hon. member of the House should describe a measure of this kind as a type of stealing and a type of electoral depravity or electoral villainy is certainly surprising. When a question of an election was mooted last autumn, my attention was then directed to the fact that complications might result if those who had gone and those who were going overseas had not an opportunity to vote. Coming from a city that has been for a century a military headquarters, a city that has sent more than its quota to this war, a city in which the number of electors who have gone to

serve the Empire more than equals the average majority of any candidate ever elected, there, I felt it my duty to take into consideration whether some method could not be devised as to how those men might exercise their franchise. To-night I have listened with considerable interest to the speeches made on the other side of the House and as I have listened to the utterances from one hon. member opposite and then from another, I have been struck by the fact that they thoroughly failed to hang together in their arguments although the general tenor of their complaint is that this Bill should not pass. One offers one objection, another offers another, but all are in accord in saying: this measure should not become law.

The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) in addressing the House, took the liberty of drawing our attention to the fact that in his judgement a Bill should have been passed at the last session in August by which the men who went overseas (before they left Canada), would have had an opportunity of voting for the Government or for the Opposition, and hardly had the echoes of his words ceased to resound through this Chamber than he made complaint that this Bill should not come into force because the men in the trenches would not have an opportunity of discussing the issues before the country and being advised on them. How in the world could the men who went to the front in August have an opportunity of considering the issues if they could not have that opportunity under this Bill? Let us take a broader view of the question. If there is one thing that has impressed us in this country more than another in regard to this war, it is the wonderful spontaneity of Canadians in volunteering for service. We had no conscription; we had no great military class; we had no militarism in the broad sense of the word; but we did have an appeal made to the citizens of this country that they should rally to their flag, to their King, and to their country, because we felt that this war meant much to Canada. I do not know how many of us were impressed by what the war might mean to the world at large, although it means much. We were, however, impressed by this fact, that no country in the world would be more affected by this war than the North American continent, because we never had conscription here, and we always had opportunities for individual liberty, and it followed surely, as the night the day, that if the Germans were successful conscription and militarism must for our future protection and safety be brought into force in this country. It is, therefore, I say, that the spontaneous response of our countrymen was praiseworthy

But, my hon. friends opposite say: Although our citizens responded liberally and well, we should not recognize that; because a man risks his life in the service of the State we should deprive him of the greatest civil right a man has—the right of expressing himself on the public questions affecting the well-being and good government of the State. Is not the greatest test of the zeal of the people for their country their willingness to do and die for the ideals and the principles they hold dear? If, then, men who have volunteered to go to the front are willing to risk their lives in this cause, why should those of us who stay at home be unwilling (should there be an election?) to give them an opportunity of voting upon national issues. It seems to me that if we are to properly recognize the worth of the men who have volunteered, we should be consistent and give to those who have gone to the front an opportunity to vote. It is quite true, as the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) has said that all men may not take advantage of the opportunity, and that all men may not be in a position to vote. No one knows whether or when an election is to be held, and when the day comes it is quite possible that the men who are in Flanders to-day may not be in a position to vote; but those of us who stay at home, and who are reaping the advantage of the services which those men are giving at the front, those of us at least who are in Parliament, will have the satisfaction of saying: we did what we could to place the franchise at your disposal; if the exigencies of the war prevent your taking advantage of the opportunity, we regret it, but we did the very best we could.

Suppose this Bill were not to be passed look at the anomalies and incongruities that there are going to be. By section 157 of the Dominion Elections Act, every man who was a volunteer, no matter where he was in Canada, would be entitled to vote in the electoral district in which he had been living, provided he was on the list and could get there to vote. See what is going to happen from one end of Canada to the other. You are going to have a large number of volunteers who would have the

right to vote, but who could only vote provided they could return to the place whence they came. Where would there be discipline then? The men who came from Vancouver might be in Halifax; the men who came from Winnipeg might be at Petawawa, and are all those men to be returned to their homes? If that were so, then for a month the military camps of Canada would be in a turmoil.

Section 159 provides that even though a man were not on the electoral list he should be entitled to vote provided his not being on the list resulted from the fact that he was engaged in active service when the list was prepared. In other words, the man who has been in active service abroad, on returning to Canada would be entitled to go to the deputy returning officer and swear in his vote. The man in Canada who had not gone abroad, though his name were on the list and by the provision of the Ontario law, there is a form of registration that would permit many men to go on the list by virtue of a friend making the necessary affidavit that he is a British subject, and has been twelve months in Ontario, and three months in the district—could qualify and vote. But the men who have actually faced the enemy, the men who have been in the shadow of death, are to be deprived of their votes, being unable to vote in person because of the miles of water between England and Canada. That struck me as radically unfair, and the question pressed itself upon me: how are these men to vote? There were various ways by which it might be done, and a number of ways were suggested in the committee. In the opinion of the Minister of Justice the way provided in this Bill is the best that can be devised and it seems to me a fair and reasonable solution of the difficulty.

I cannot see eye to eye with the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) who insinuates that men who are fighting in the shadow of eternity are going to do corrupt and iniquitous things. I know nothing about his western electoral methods, but I do know there are honourable officers at the front, men who would discharge their sacred duty—for so it is—of performing with honesty their part in the electoral machinery of Canada and who would, when required, see to it that the soldiers who came before them had the opportunity to mark their ballots as they desire without fear and free from intimidation. And these ballots, having been marked and properly enclosed in an envelope, would be sent forward to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, without interference and without irregularity. I am satisfied that once these ballots reach that officer there would be no difficulty whatever in elaborating plans that would prevent any irregularity in regard to the votes being received by deputy returning officers and counted. If the hon. member for Edmonton is sincere, and if he is willing to facilitate the measure, why does he not admit the principle, and, then when the Bill comes to Committee of the Whole it will be a simple thing to insert a provision that when the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery sends the ballots forward to the deputy returning officer, notice should be sent to each candidate of that fact, and the ballots should be on receipt sealed with the seals of the candidates, and not opened until both candidates or their agents are present to see them counted. There is no difficulty in working out the machinery if you want to work it out, but there is great difficulty if you do not want to secure results.

I believe hon. gentlemen opposite are not sincere in their opposition to this Bill. I am one who has not always supported the party to which I belong, but I do believe that in a great measure of this sort, where recognition is being given to a class of people who are willing to risk their lives for a principle which they hold dear, we should set to one side party politics, get down to realities, and try to draft a measure that would prevent fraud, and that the men who are at the front would realize that there is no politics in being a soldier, but that every soldier, being a volunteer and a free man, should have the right to exercise his franchise, and that in joining the King's colours he did not take from himself that which we all hold most dear, the right to express himself by his vote on the conduct of his country's affairs.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland): My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) spoke of himself as one who has not always been in accord with the policy of his party and yet was in favour of this Bill. I feel it incumbent on me, being one who has not always been in accord with the policy of his party, to declare myself as absolutely opposed to this Bill. I am not opposed to it because it is introduced by this Government; I would be equally opposed to it if it were introduced by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)

were he Prime Minister. My reasons for being opposed to the Bill may not be exactly those expressed thus far in the discussion. I do think the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) has been too inflammable, if I may use that expression, during this session of Parliament. He began the session with a threat that if we on this side of the House dared—he did not use the word "dare," but that was the effect of his suggestion—to criticise the policy of the Government, he would carry the attack into our ranks and show that we were no better than they. I do not think that that made for unity of purpose at this particular crisis of the affairs of the Empire. To-night he has reiterated that proposition, saying that he had no knowledge at present that there would be an election in the near future, but the action of the Opposition tended to show that they were carrying a chip on their shoulder and rather wanted to have an election. The effect of an election upon me personally is not of the slightest interest; but in its effect upon the people of this country I think an election during the progress of this war would be a catastrophe. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that if he wants to go down in history as one of Canada's greatest statesmen, and one of the Empire's biggest men, he should now declare that during the progress of this war, so far as he is concerned and so far as his leadership of the Conservative party goes, there will be no election until this war is over. I can assure him that a proposition of this kind, emanating from him, will make for him more friends in the province of Ontario than any other course he could pursue, for the people of the province of Ontario, at least ninety per cent of them, irrespective of politics, do not want an election—of that I am absolutely certain. What were we on this side to do or to consider? Last fall we heard threats and talk of an election.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that the question before the House is the second reading of a Bill and not the question of an election.

Mr. GERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will keep as close to the subject of debate as I can, and if I encroach upon the rules in the remarks I am making, I will go no further, except to say this, that, unless there is to be an election before another session of Parliament, there is no necessity for this Bill. If there is to be another session before an election, then, next session, if it is thought necessary that the soldiers abroad should have votes, let us get together and devise some scheme whereby they can have votes under all safeguards, which parties on both sides of the House will agree to.

The fact that this Bill is introduced at the present time and that the term of this Parliament will not expire until September, 1916, would lead one to believe that an election will take place before another session of Parliament is held. We are led to believe that there will be an election this summer, and that that is the object of the Government's bringing forward this legislation. That being the case—and we can draw no other conclusion—why am I opposed to this Bill? Because it is founded on sentiment, not on sense, and, if worked out at all, it will be worked out in absolute ignorance on the part of the voters, and with an entire absence of good results. Sentiment enters into the actions of most people, but in a case of this kind it seems to me that we should be governed by something more than sentiment.

It has been urged that we would be well advised if we should follow the example of New Zealand in the matter of legislation of this kind. I quite agree with the hon. member for Edmonton that the New Zealand Bill was passed for quite another purpose. The New Zealand elections were announced early in November last, and the elections were held on December 10. On December 24, notwithstanding the fact that the parties in the New Zealand Legislature were pretty evenly divided, the votes cast by the soldiers had not been returned to New Zealand. If the soldiers who voted in Egypt were given the privilege of voting in order that they might decide the political situation, surely the votes would have been returned to New Zealand long before they were. Whether or not they have yet been returned, I do not know. The London Times gives the bald fact that about 10,000 New Zealanders voted in Egypt, but on December 24 those votes had not been returned to New Zealand, so that they were of no use in deciding the political contest between the parties in that Overseas Dominion.

The people of Canada during the past winter have been striving unitedly and energetically to raise an enormous patriotic fund. Every person in Canada, from one end of it to the other has been striving to the best of his ability, energy and influence to assist in the establishing of a patriotic fund to support the families of the brave men from Canada who have gone to the front. That work is still going

on, and will continue until this cruel war is over. Let us assume that there is an election in June, as there may be, or that there is to be an election before the war is over, as there is likely to be, judging by the fact that this Bill has been introduced. Suppose that in a close constituency one representative is returned by the vote of the resident people, and at five o'clock on the eve of election day the residential vote declares a certain man elected. That night or the next day the vote of the soldiers is counted, and that count reverses the verdict.

Mr. WILCOX: How can it be counted the next day?

Mr. GERMAN: It is counted after the poll is closed; it cannot be counted before.

Mr. ROGERS: All votes are counted after the poll is closed.

Mr. GERMAN: All votes are counted after the poll is closed, but the vote of the soldiers is not counted until after the residential vote is counted. I was assuming that in several counties the residential vote should declare one way and the soldiers' vote, sent from Belgium, Flanders or Germany, should change the result of the election while the war is in progress. Would any hon. gentleman say that that would tend to make for unity of thought and harmony of action in the constituency concerned in the matter of the raising of funds to care for the families of the soldiers who are abroad? From the county of Welland about 600 brave men have gone to the front. We in the county of Welland are loyally, faithfully and industriously doing our duty to look after the families of these men, and intend to continue doing so. I am not afraid of the vote of the young men who have left the county of Welland, but assuming that, in some other county, changes are made by reason of the votes which are cast by the soldiers, I say that the condition which would bring about that result is a wrong principle to introduce into the policy of this country at a time when a great war is raging and when every man's mind and heart and soul and interest and industry should be centered on one object: the success of the allied troops and the maintenance of British supremacy. The soldiers at the front cannot possibly know the issues that will be involved in the election. Further, the personal equation in elections counts for a good deal. I do not think that the right hon. the Prime Minister or the right hon. the leader of he Opposiion should arrogate the vote of the people exclusively to themselves, or to the parties which they represent. Very frequently votes are cast for the representative himself; often the personal equation enters into the election contest more strongly, perhaps, than the policy of a party. How can the man at the front know for whom he is voting? He has to vote for a Government, or an Opposition, or an independent candidate. He does not know who will represent him in Parliament. Probably if he knew the Government candidate he would not vote for him; probably if he knew the Opposition candidate, though the voter might be a Liberal, he would not vote for him, thinking that the candidate would not be fitted to represent him and his views in Parliament. I contend that the soldier under these conditions would vote in absolute ignorance of the situation. I defy any gentleman in this House to say that any soldier has ever asked to have a vote. The Minister of Justice was asked a question in that respect, which he has not yet answered. Will the Prime Minister, if he can, state one instance in which the soldiers have asked that they be allowed to vote. They are going to the front to fight the battles of Canada and of the British Empire. They are not thinking about votes half so much as the politicians are thinking about giving them votes. I trust that the politicians are not thinking about controlling the votes after the ballots have been marked. I would not accuse any one of that. But, at this time, when this war is in progress, I say leave this over until another session of Parliament. Then, when we meet together, if the soldiers are still in the trenches and it is thought necessary that they should have votes, let us get together and devise a scheme whereby they can vote intelligently, vote under proper protection, and I for one will aid in that purpose as well as in any other purpose which I consider to be to the advantage of Canada. But at the present time I am opposed to the idea of an election, I am opposed to the idea of flinging the soldiers into the arena of politics, I am opposed to the proposition of bringing about a contention in this country that will break the harmony which now prevails and the unity which now exists. I say, let us go on with one heart, one hope and one endeavour to reach if possible that wealth of freedom which British victory will secure.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto): Just a word, because I realize that the hour is late and much has been said. One cannot have heard the discussion that has taken place on this Bill and read the Bill without being conscious that this committee has laboured long and faithfully to bring about a result which would be agreeable to this House and to the country. The committee was a non-partisan committee. It was open for any hon. gentleman or anybody else to appear before it and give his views, and apparently until this Bill was brought into this House and the second reading was asked for, the committee made no objection nor was there any difference in the opinion of the committee in regard to the measure now before the House. Where are the hon. gentlemen who represented the Opposition in the House on this committee? They are not here to-night. There has been no complaint from these hon. gentlemen, there has been no minority report, there has been nothing except the appearance of perfect harmony with respect to the provisions of this Bill. I quite approve of all that has been said upon the line of the desirability of observing perfect neutrality in a matter of this kind, and I second the sentiment expressed by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. German), that there should be but one heart and one sentiment and one will behind this war. I say that this very Bill will do all that we can do that we have not already done in the matter of giving our soldiers who are at the front heart and courage and encouragement of all kinds from this House and from this country. What are we doing? Are these men aliens? They certainly are not, they are British subjects, 99 out of 100 probably are Canadian citizens; and all that this Bill provides is that they shall have the right to vote. Does any hon. gentleman in this House believe now that they are not entitled to vote? Because nine out of ten of them are on the list already. The Bill does not go as far as I would like to see. Personally I would like to see it give every man who is fighting a vote whether he be of age or under age. If he is a man performing the functions of a man for our country and our Empire he should have a vote. But the Bill has stopped short at men of 21 years of age and only those vote. What good purpose can be served by putting any impediment or barrier in the way of these men voting?

The hon. gentleman who has just sat down agreed with the spirit and principle of the Bill. His opinion is apparently that this is not the time or the opportunity to deal prudently and in a cool and deliberate manner with it. His opinion is that there should be a Bill of this kind at another session. Then, of course, if a Bill of this kind is at any time passed either at this session or at a future session, it must be in contemplation of an election, otherwise it is useless waste paper. A Bill of this kind, if passed, must contemplate its being used in the election. If one were to look for any reason why the Opposition in this House is opposed to this Bill it would be very difficult to find any concrete argument that has been made by any of these hon. gentlemen either individually or as a whole. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down is in favour of the principle of the Bill and would favour passing it at another session. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) says: Oh, yes, let us pass this Bill but only in so far as it will apply to soldiers who have not gone to the war. I understood that to be his argument.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh, no, I do not wish to be understood in that way at all. My objection to the Bill was that the provisions in regard to the soldiers who had not gone to the front were not suitable to the case; that they lent themselves absolutely to improper handling.

Mr. MACDONELL: It comes to the same thing very largely, he would give votes to those who have not gone to the war if that were done then when they went to war some provision of this kind would have to be made giving them a vote.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not object to those who have gone to the war having votes, but I wish to see proper safeguards as to the method of voting.

Mr. MACDONELL: That comes down to the great body and burden of opinion on the opposite side; it is a matter of detail. Everything that has been said by way of criticism on the second reading of this Bill could be dealt with and properly dealt with in Committee of the Whole, if the hon. gentlemen who are expressing these opinions are honest and sincere with them. But we find, that a good deal of criticism on this Bill comes from those who see evil in it. We know the old motto, evil be to him who evil thinks, "Honi soit qui mal y pense." That might very well be applied to much of what

has been said against this Bill. I wish to point out what is known to hon. gentlemen in this House, that of all classes of the community who poll their votes faithfully the soldiers stand at the top of the list. I know of no element or part of the community that values its vote more than the military, either the regular soldiers or the volunteers. But we find that in a measure and in a certain sense this very principle is now adopted and applied. As has been said by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, there is no Franchise Act now in Canada as a whole. There was one, but there is none now. Each province has its own law. In the month of June, when the registration for the voters' lists takes place for Dominion or Provincial purposes, if the soldiers are in camp, as they frequently are in that month, they register themselves by the thousands simply by making affidavits very similar in principle to the affidavit called for by this very Bill, or by having comrades make affidavits on their behalf, so that they are now advanced to at least one-half of the privileges which this Bill gives them, they have, by the law of Ontario—and I fancy this is fairly general throughout the Dominion—the right to register although they are not at the place of registration, in the way I have indicated. What is the use of talking about qualifications nowadays and saying this Bill provides no qualifications? We all know that manhood suffrage to-day prevails throughout Canada and that is all that this Bill contemplates. Every man of 21 years of age who is a British subject and resident a certain time in any community is entitled to vote. So we are by this Bill merely giving manhood suffrage, which is the law to-day practically throughout Canada, to the people who are now entitled to vote, and the only difference between what the law is now and what it will be after this Bill becomes law is that those who are away on active service shall be permitted by some lawful means to transmit a vote into the ballot box and have it counted on election day. The hon. member for Edmonton was very apprehensive about corruption. He was one of those who saw bogies everywhere. But I should like to point out to him that under this Bill the ballot papers will be sent by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the office of the Canadian High Commissioner in London, who in turn will send them to the proper officer or officers who will give the necessary papers to each volunteer entitled to vote. Every safeguard has been provided for, from the time the ballots leave Ottawa until they get back. Every precaution has been taken for ensuring secrecy. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) was was anxious as to the counting of the votes afterwards, and he referred to the case of New Zealand. In New Zealand the votes did not arrive for some days after the poll was held. But no such condition could arise under this Bill, for it provides that the votes shall be counted on polling day. I should be very sorry to see what the hon. member for Welland has in his mind's eye, namely, the civilians voting one way and the soldiers another. The people of this country are all one, whether soldiers or civilians. Nine-tenths of the soldiers are civilians anyway, who have gone to fight for the Empire from patriotic and manly motives. They will come back to their ordinary vocations with the honours and prestige that attach to men who have been engaged in a noble cause for their country in time of need. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. H. Clark) reminds me that every vote has the same value whether it is a civilian's or a soldier's. The vote of the civilian should be worth 100 per cent, and so should the vote of the soldier; and the soldier's vote will be worth 100 per cent under this Bill. A great deal has been said to-night about liberties, British institutions, democracy and so forth. But where would democracy be if it were not for the soldiers who are fighting the battles of the country at the front? Who, I ask, is entitled to greater consideration at the present time than these men who are preserving the liberties and freedom of this country? And I am referring not only to our own soldiers, but to the men from all parts of the Empire, the Old Country included. It seems to me that if the soldiers of any part of the Empire are entitled to a vote or to any great consideration it is the soldiers who have gone from Canada. I do not desire to belittle the efforts of men who have gone to the front from other parts of the overseas dominions, but Canada, of all the dominions, is the only one that has no material interest in this war. Her only interest is loyalty to the Empire and to herself. All the other dominions have as neighbours German colonies by which they have been menaced, and it is only natural to expect that after the war these German colonies will form part of the nearby British Dominions. It is quite possible anyway. But the

11 p.m

soldiers of Canada have gone from loyalty to the Empire and to Canada, loyalty to liberty and to everything that is right and proper in mankind.

On referring to my notes I am afraid I have attributed a remark to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) which was made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I think it was the hon. member for St. John who was in favour of giving a vote to the soldiers who hereafter go to the war, but not to the soldiers who have already gone. What are we to make of this patchwork of opinions from the Opposition side of the House? One hon. gentleman says they should all have votes, another says that none of them should have votes, another says give half of them votes. What harmony is there in that? I think some of the criticisms of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition were trifling, if he will permit me to say so. One great objection that he had was that we were creating a franchise. I can recollect as a boy, and my right hon. friend can recollect better than I can, when we had a whole week's open vote at election time. Was it desirable to change that practice? I think so. And shall we not change our practice from time to time as democracy progresses? Are we to stick forever to a certain method of voting? Surely not. Suppose that we are creating a franchise, which I deny, what evil is there in that? I see no harm in it. I do not think my right hon. friend's objection will appeal to many hon. gentlemen in this House or out of it. Then he likened the soldiers to railwaymen or fishermen or lumbermen whose vocations take them away from home, but who have a permanent residence and a vote in Canada. I should like to point out to my right hon. friend that these men he speaks of are all entitled to vote; they can return to their homes on election day. But the soldier cannot do that, and that is just the difference between the two classes. Another reason that the right hon. gentleman gave for not giving soldiers votes was that they were being well treated already, and he pointed out that they were to have pensions. Surely every civilized country in the world treats its soldiers well, and gives them pensions. That is not an over-humane act. Surely it is the least we can do. I do not think that the people of this country will consider that in giving votes to the soldiers we are treating them magnanimously.

So far as I can sum up the opposition to this Bill it is this: hon. gentlement opposite trust nobody, not even the soldiers. They are afraid that the soldier will not exercise his franchise with that secrecy and propriety which is ordinarily required in the polling of votes. As I have pointed out, the Bill provides a complete chain of safeguards from the time the ballots leave the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery until they return to Ottawa. No reasonable objection has yet been made. The Bill is founded on motives of propriety, and I believe the people of this country will demand it. Furthermore, I believe that the soldiers who have left the country understood that they were going to be given an opportunity to vote; so that in passing this Bill we are doing no more than carrying out the spirit of what was generally believed to be an implied agreement entered into between the public of this country and the men who are fighting at the front. That is, that they shall have every good treatment that can be given to them and an opportunity of voting was certainly considered to be something that they would enjoy. I appeal to hon. gentlemen to pass this Bill and to do the proper thing. If there is any detail of the Bill that can be improved the time and place to do it is in committee. Let the Bill leave committee in such shape that it will be agreed to by both parties and I believe it will meet with the approval of every person in the country.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) has made reference to some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who were members of the committee who considered this measure. I do not know that I would have risen were it not that my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) desired me to say, owing to the fact that he was called away this morning, that he did not consider this measure as it was submitted to the House a proper solution of the problem as to how the soldiers should have their votes polled and that had he been here he would have voted against the measure along those lines. It is a very peculiar measure. In the face of the greatest war that was ever waged, in view of the demands that are being made upon every citizen in the Empire and upon every man with a drop of British blood in his veins, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House turn aside from the consideration of their re-

sponsibilities as British citizens, and as having to do with the Government of Canada, and the part which Canada has to play in this Empire, and sit down and try to devise some method by which votes may be polled. This is purely an election measure. There is no precedent for it. The idea that a Government should provide for going into another country where the enemy are engaging in battle with our sons to hold a poll has never been suggested anywhere. You will search the history of England in vain to find any precedent for the action which is now being taken. We are having this done here for the first time. Were it not for the fact that hon. gentlemen are intending to have an election we would not have this Bill before us at all. You see it on the face of the Bill itself. The first section creates a franchise and the second provides that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, shall immediately send to the office of the High Commissioner in Great Britain a certain number of ballots. It says that he shall send them right off and, the language being peremptory, this is a duty imposed upon the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery which he must immediately fulfil. Why is it that we are to have an election? The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) intimated that because of the conduct of the Opposition, because we ventured to criticise the Government in connection with the purchase of boots, and because of something that was happening in the Public Accounts Committee, although he had not thought about an election he was now thinking about it. Since the 16th day of February I have been sitting in the committee appointed for the purpose of investigating the supply of boots to the soldiers but I am not sitting in that committee on account of any action on the part of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It is on account of the right hon. gentleman's own action. He moved the committee and declared it to be necessary. Therefore, why should he complain? If things come out in that committee why should he complain about it? Does he suggest that the hon. gentlemen who happen to compose that committee are to sit there and register his decrees in regard to the question which the committee has to deal, that we are to cease to perform our functions as members of Parliament and members of that committee? Why? Hon. gentlemen behind him were deliberating as to how, in the midst of this great war there could be some political scheme devised in regard to votes and that is why they were not doing anything in regard to boots or criticising anything that had been done.

My right hon. friend intimated on the day that the address was debated on the opening of this session of Parliament that every hon. member of this House and the country at large were entitled to the fullest information with regard to all expenditures of a military character. When, adopting his own suggestion, there were referrered to the Public Accounts Committee expenditures for military purposes, my right hon. friend proclaims that because hon. gentlemen have been performing their duties as members of Parliament they have been doing something which is trespassing upon the position which the Government occupy and doing something which warrant my right hon. friend, in the face of this war, in plunging this country into a general election. There is not much use in discussing the question of where he personally stands upon this matter of a general election. Every one who has been through an election knows that these things are in the hands of the fates.

But if my right hon. friend wants to divide up this country, if he wants to stop recruiting, if he wants to stay the hand of generosity, if he wants to chill the response to the appeals which are being made to the patriotism of our people in every part of the country, if he wants to paralyse the efforts of those who are trying to do all they can for Belgium and the wives and children of the men who have gone to the front, if he wants to turn the people in every hamlet from the peaceful avocations which they have undertaken for the purpose of doing their part in dealing with the situation and doing their duty to the Empire, he will bring about this internecine struggle which will have as a result the tearing asunder of the good feeling which exists and which is contributing so greatly to the cause that all British subjects have so much at heart—if, I say, my right hon. friend wants to do these things he can get offended at what was done in the Public Accounts Committee and the Boots Committee.

My right hon. friend does not respond to the appeal which was made by my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) and he foregoes the opportunity of putting himself on record as being the big man in this country. The time will come when the people will estimate him at his true worth. It is because there has been all this talk about a general election that we have this

Bill. The second clause provides that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall send ballots across the ocean at once for that particular reason. What is the use of discussing the abstract question as to whether soldiers should have votes or not in the way in which the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) did? The soldier who is a citizen of this country has a right to vote; there can be no question about that. Who can question that, and why should we take up the time with platitudes about Parliament wanting to provide for his voting? But this fantastic measure of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is another thing altogether. There is a great deal of difference between the abstract proposition that a soldier who is a citizen of this country should have a vote and the method by which the Minister of Justice proposes to enable him to vote. In the first place, this measure is altogether so unique in its character, having regard to the war situation, that one might well ask that why is it that over in the Imperial Parliament, which is sitting just now, we have never heard that the great statesmen who are considering this war problem have proposed any scheme by which the men who live in the British Islands, and who are now across the channel fighting for the Empire, shall record their votes in a general election? Why is it that we have never heard of it? Nobody has ever suggested the possibility of it. Therefore, why is this measure introduced at all? If we are not going to have a general election, as my hon. friend from Welland says, we do not need this Bill.

If we are going to have a general election, then the soldiers are entitled to vote if their votes can be recorded under proper safeguards and under proper conditions. Parliament since Confederation has time and again taken up days and weeks and months deliberating questions of the franchise and of the proper method of safeguarding the manner in which the voting of this country shall be carried on. My hon. friend proposes to dispose of those safeguards with one fell swoop. It does not matter to him that we have no regard to what Parliament has done in the past, whereby even in the quiet hamlets of this country it has provided for the greatest possible secrecy and honesty in polling. He says: We are going to provide a scheme here absolutely unique and novel in its character, because we want a general election, and we are going to have this measure passed whether you like it or not; if you say anything, you are disloyal and you do not want the soldiers to vote. This was the text of my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) to-night. If it was not, I do not know the English language. It is time that full-grown men in this country, who have reached the position of being representatives of the people, should give up reiterating in this House speeches which they make only in localities where they presume upon the ignorance of the audience they are addressing. If they would make fewer of such speeches and more attempts to consider cold facts, instead of hurling across the floor from time to time taunts that hon. gentlemen on this side are disloyal, because we do not see eye to eye with them on every proposition they may bring forward, it would be better for the dignity of this Parliament and more for the honour of this country, and, as British citizens and parliamentarians, we would have more pride in ourselves if we looked at questions in that way. That is the way in which I would like to look at this proposition to-night. Shall our soldiers who are fighting for their country have an opportunity of exercising their franchise? I say, yes, if you can provide honest and proper methods by which those votes can be dropped into the ballot box, without disarranging the whole electoral machinery of this country, without violating all the canons of the election law, without disregarding every principle which has characterized British parliamentary Government ever since we have had parliamentary government. Why was it that in the days of the Crimean war, and during all the various wars of the last three-quarters of a century, the English Parliament never passed a measure of this character? My hon. friend the Minister of Justice this afternoon read the provisions of a measure which he said had passed the second reading in the English Parliament, and he went on to say that because that Parliament was so busy the measure was never heard of again. If that is the way in which the statesmen who guide this Empire carry on its affairs, it is time we found it out. If they are too busy to pass measures of the greatest possible importance in the interests of the country, then they are not performing their duty. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice knows full well that that is not the reason, and that the reason why the measure was not passed is because the mature judgment of the Imperial Parliament in considering this question was that it was absolutely impracticable. I presume this Bill will pass from its second reading to the Com-

mittee of the Whole, in which each one of the details can be discussed; but the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who discussed this matter with his usual earnestness, appealed to the House to do one thing —to put the Canadian people in the position of saying: Although we do not expect that any of these votes will ever be recorded in Flanders, or Belgium, or Germany, we shall be able to say that we did what we could to give our soldiers an opportunity to vote. That is a very nice thing to be able to say; but let me point out that, if we have any responsibility here as public men, when we are endeavouring to place upon the statute books of this country any measure dealing with such an important question as amending the Dominion Election Act, we are not doing so because we want to be able to say to some one else that we tried to do the best for them, although we could not effect anything. If we cannot put on the statute books a measure that is absolutely workable in every respect, having in it all those safeguards which Parliament in previous years has always regarded as being absolutely essential to the proper recording of votes in this country, what is the sense of putting a measure on the statute-book which will enable us to say we did what we could?

Mr. MACDONELL: Is the hon. member in favour of the principle of the Bill?

Mr. MACDONALD: I am in favour of giving votes to our soldiers if we can provide the proper means of doing so and the proper safeguards. This measure does not offer a possible, even a plausible condition by which that can be done. When we come to discuss the question in its details, the anomalies and difficulties in regard to the measure can be very readily pointed out. Therefore it seems to me that we are discussing on the second reading, not the details of the measure, because they will be discussed later on, but the wisdom and the advisability of putting on the statute-books in this year of grace, 1915, this peculiar legislation which has never before seen the light in all the long past of the parliamentary government of this Empire. This legislation should not be put upon the statute-book, because the right hon. gentleman, who is responsible to the people of this country for the advice which he gives His Royal Highness, knows as well as I do that if he throws Canada into the throes of an election contest, he produces a condition under which will be utterly destroyed all those feelings of unity and of devotion to the flag which today animate the Canadian people to a greater degree than ever before in our long history. He will stop recruiting; he will disarrange all the conditions, and of course he will have to take the responsibility. It is because my right hon. friend is thinking of having an election that we have this measure. If he were not thinking of having an election, we would not have this Bill at all, and therefore, I say on the second reading of this Bill that it is totally unnecessary, utterly uncalled for and without the slightest justification. When it passes to the Committee of the Whole, as I assume it will, I shall be prepared to discuss the details, and point out at greater length what seem to me to be the anomalies of this measure, but do not let it be understood that hon. gentlemen on this side are opposed to any man who happens to wear the King's uniform having a vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You have said so several times.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who has?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark).

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. member for Red Deer can speak for himself in regard to that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is trying to speak for him.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend from Red Deer, if I understood him aright, pointed out the anomalies of the men who are fighting in the trenches in Flanders going and recording their vote, and he said that they should follow Kitchener's principle. He argued that the men in Flanders were thinking more of fighting the Germans than of voting.

Mr. GERMAN: The hon. member for Red Deer has a son in the trenches.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: In the garrisons at Halifax, Sydney and Canso, there are something like 1,200 men, 300 of whom come from Charlottetown and Prince Edward Island generally, and four or five hundred from New Brunswick.

These men cannot leave the garrison to go to vote. They are farmers' sons, many of them men of substance in their several provinces. Would it be just or right to deprive these men of the franchise?

Mr. MACDONALD: These men will not be deprived of their franchise unless my hon. friend's leader wants to bring on an election this year. My hon. friend the casuist from Portage la Prairie, the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), will hardly be able to distort the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) into an intimation of a policy on the part of the Liberal party to prevent the soldiers from having votes. As to that, I wish to say that the hon. gentleman belongs to the school on the other side whose particular business seems to be to throw out imputations on the score of loyalty and patriotism. I do think that, as the rising hope of the Conservative party, as he is, he ought to be a little more ambitious to rise to higher lines than to indulge in such claptrap as that which, if he must use it, should be used only in the backwoods of his constituency. It is not worthy of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is out of order to speak of the utterance of an hon. member as unworthy.

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr Speaker, of course I bow to your ruling in regard to that; but I would point out that the language which one has to use to characterize actions of that kind must be more vigorous than ornate. I reiterate that, as I understand the views of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, we hold this measure as entirely unnecessary, unless hon. gentlemen opposite are going to have an election. That is the preliminary question at the basis of this whole measure. The soldiers who are abroad, like the soldiers who are at home, as Canadian citizens should have votes, if those votes can be recorded with due regard to the safeguards which are thrown around elections in this country. And this Bill does not provide such safeguards.

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): It is not my intention at this late hour to occupy much of the time of the House, but I feel it to be my duty to express my reasons for opposing this Bill. Let me say at once, I am strongly in favour of giving the soldiers votes, but I am in favour of giving them votes when they come back victorious from France and Germany. As has been said, if this Government does not intend to have an election, there is absolutely no need for this Bill. If we grant that, we must acknowledge that this is nothing but a political measure. It is offered here with the idea of winning votes in this country from the friends and relatives of the soldiers at the front; it is offered here with the idea of affording the Government party from one end of the country to the other an opportunity to go forth and wave the flag as they have done so often before. I do not like to impute motives of this kind against any Government, but I consider it perfectly clear that this Government are glad that we are opposing this Bill. We have evidence of that from the gentlemen on the other side who have already spoken, because, without exception they have accused the members of the Opposition of being opposed to the principle of a vote for the soldiers. We on this side have without exception stated that we are not opposed to the soldiers voting but that we are opposed to the provisions of this Bill which do not safeguard the secrecy of the ballot or the rights of the voters.

It is possible, in fact it is probable, that if this war should continue, I myself shall be at the front. I have already offered my services to Colonel Baker when he was forming the 5th Mounted Rifles, and although I was not accepted, I should like to say to the Minister of Militia that at any time he requires my services or would like them, they are absolutely at his disposal. I have had some experience in military life, and I feel perfectly sure that if I ever land in the trenches, be it in Belgium, or France, or Germany, the very last thing I shall want to bother my mind about will be an election in Canada. Like the men who are there now I shall have on my mind greater things than that. Those men are busy day and night in defence of this country, in defence of this Empire. They will not have time or disposition to read party literature, or to hear political discussions from their officers; nor will their officers if they fulfil their duty, have time to collect ballots or discuss politics with the soldiers.

Mr. EDWARDS: If this Bill passes, will the soldiers have to vote?

Mr. KAY: I should imagine, Sir, that under some of the officers, they would.

Mr. EDWARDS: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would name some of those officers. If I may be permitted, I should like to say that an hon. gentleman who would cast a slur like that upon officers ought to be willing to name them.

Mr. KAY: As I was saying I feel that if I get over there, I shall not care one jot whether this Government is returned or

whether this Government is defeated. I shall expect if I am there, that this Government will do its duty to this country as I shall be doing mine.

I shall not expect them to waste their time in the political strife which would be involved in a general election. They will have quite enough to do if they devote their energies and abilities to carrying out the tremendous task which is now imposed upon them; if they direct their energies towards seeing that contracts are honestly and faithfully carried out and that the evildoers, grafters, and political heelers have no opportunity of wrongfully obtaining the money of the people of Canada.

I am not in favour of the details of this Bill; I do not think that the proposed method of obtaining the votes of the soldiers is such as to carry out the objects of the promotors of the Bill. When this Bill is considered in committee, its details may be more fully discussed. If the right hon. Prime Minister is sincere in the remarks which he made to-day with regard to voting by the soldiers, why does he not declare that there shall not be an election until the war is over, or until the term of the present Parliament expires? If he should do this, he would show his absolute sincerity; he would give evidence of the fact that he puts his country above his party, and that he really believes that the soldier should have a vote. I quite fail to see how, under this Bill, the soldiers would be enabled to vote for any particular representative. It is all very well to say: vote for the Government or vote for the Opposition; but it should be remembered that many voters vote not for the party, but for the man. There is no hurry for the passing of this Bill. The Prime Minister has said to-night that an election has not been decided upon; that the matter has not been discussed. I think it would be reasonable, therefore, to expect the Prime Minister to explain to this House how it is that he allows the hon. Minister of Justice to bring down a Bill which can only have in view the holding of an election this year.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN (Sunbury and Queens): I do not intend at this late hour to take up the time of the House by restating the arguments that have been advanced in favour of the principle of this Bill, or in giving at length the reasons why I am in favour of votes for soldiers. I wish simply to place myself on record as being strongly in favour of votes for soldiers. When the Bill is under consideration in committee, I shall be able to discuss its provisions at greater length, and, perhaps, to go fully into the details of the Bill.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.): I wish to endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Mississquoi (Mr. Kay). I have two sons who are engaged in this conflict; my eldest son is with the second contingent in St. John, and my youngest son is with the Mounted Rifles in Sherbrooke. While I am desirous that the soldiers of our Dominion should be enabled to cast their vote, unless that can be done in a reasonable way and with all proper safeguards, to my mind we had better leave well enough alone. There is a good deal in what has been said by the hon. gentleman that the soldiers will not know the issues of any election that may be held. Further, I am afraid that undue influence may be brought to bear upon the soldiers in the trenches. We were assured to-day that canvassing would not be allowed, but we are aware of the fact that there is an indirect means of canvassing a voter. I do not see how it would be possible to prevent literature from getting into the hands of the soldiers. During the election of 1911 I practically received a letter appealing to me as a Liberal—that letter was sent broadcast throughout this country, and was signed by R. L. Borden—to vote Tory and save Canada for the Empire. Is it not possible that a similar letter may be sent, appealing to the Liberals to sustain the Government, along the lines of the speech delivered by the right hon. gentleman in the debate on the budget? Portions of that speech, reflecting on the Liberal party, have been used by the press of the Conservative party as campaign literature. I am afraid that this matter will come down to active partisan politics, and it would be a great injustice to the people of Canada to take active partisan politics into the trenches. I think it would be unwise to have an election while the war is in progress. And if we are not to be called upon to exercise our franchise, why is there the need for the Bill now before the House? It seems to me that we might very well follow the example of the United Kingdom and keep these matters out of active politics. A remark was made by the Minister of Finance during the Budget debate which I was

sorry to hear. It was to the effect that however much loyalty my right hon. friend who leads His Majesty's loyal Opposition exercised at the present time it would be a long time before the people of this country would forget what he had done—referring to the Naval Service Act. To my mind that was uncalled for and I think the right hon. gentleman might very well have retorted to the Minister of Finance that it would be a long time before the people of Canada would forget the fact that when the right hon. gentleman had behind him unanimity of opinion in the Dominion of Canada upon the establishment of the naval service the Conservative party threw that question into active politics. So I say now it would be better, if at all possible, to leave this matter over and let us hope that the soldiers will have a vote in due time. I would go so far as to say that if the war is not concluded in 1916 I would ask the Parliament of the United Kingdom to extend the duration of this Parliament so that we might have no election until the war is over and then our soldiers, I hope a large majority of them at any rate, will return to exercise their franchise in this young nation, a nation that to me is a greater nation in a way than the nation to the south of us. There are features in which our system of Government excels that of our neighbours to the south and I say we would do well if possible—although this is a matter entirely in the hands of the Government—to avoid an election during the continuance of the war.

When the Bill is considered in Committee of the Whole I shall have some remarks to make on its details—I notice, for instance, that no provision is made for the case where two candidates of one party may be running in a constituency with no candidate for the Opposition. A by-election was called in Terrebonne where two Liberal candidates ran on an issue on which the Liberal party were divided, and there was no Conservative candidate. It is quite possible that a similar case might occur.

I am heartily in favour of granting a vote to every Canadian citizen, especially those who are absent from Canada fighting for the protection of our homes and of the greatest young nation, shall I say, and for the greatest Empire that the world has ever seen.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe): There is not now that unanimity among the members on the other side of the House that seemed to prevail before six o'clock this evening. I listened to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) and one could only understand from his statements that he was determinedly opposed to giving soldiers votes, while the gentlemen who have followed lately have seemed to veer in a contrary direction; in plain parlance they are letting themselves down as easily as possible. My reason for rising to support the Bill is that I have the honour and pleasure of representing a riding that adjoins the constituency of North Simcoe. The member who represents that riding (Mr. Currie) is not here to-night owing to the fact that he is in the firing and not in the talking line. One result of his going to the front as he has done has been that he has taken with him from the riding of North Simcoe the pick of the young men of that riding. They are business men, men who have left their businesses behind; they are farmers' sons who have their rights in that riding, they are intelligent men who know everything as to the issues to be put before the people just as well as we who may be here on the spot. Then I ask why should not these men have votes. To say that they will not know the issues is idle. They are not unintelligent men and to say that they will not know the candidates is equally idle. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) dwelt a great deal on the personality of the candidates. These young men will receive letters from their friends, they will receive the public press of the country; and long before polling day they will know of the candidates in their ridings. One reason for which hon. gentlemen oppose the Bill was told by the hon. gentleman from Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) and that is that the Bill is so popular in the country that it will attract votes of Liberals who are not away, who are resident in the country and will be here at the time of the election. There can be no mistaking his words, their purport was that every man who is in the fighting line and his friends left in Canada, Liberal or Conservative, will be voting for this Government because it is giving the vote to the soldiers here. I tell the hon. gentleman that many men will vote for that reason.

Mr. KAY: I think the hon. member misunderstood me. I said the desire of this Government was that they should get the vote of the friends of the soldiers who are in this country. I did not mean that they will get them.

Mr. BENNETT: With all due deference, I think the hon. gentleman's fear is that they will get them too. This is a popular measure in the country and hon. gentlemen apprehend that; and I think that is what the hon. gentleman had in his mind at the time. So far as the personality of the candidate goes, every soldier who votes over there will know exactly the candidates on either side in the constituency where his vote will be ultimately recorded. The hon. member for Missisquoi being not only an hon. but a gallant gentleman, I think casts rather a reflection on the officers who are in the lines. Is it to be said that a man who will risk his life over there—the hon. gentleman does not seem to be doing that at present although he is a major in the force—

Mr. KAY: I do not wish to sail under false colours, I would say I am only a lieutenant.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, there are many lieutenants over there and there is still room for one.

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. member has offered his services.

Mr. BENNETT: Hon. gentlemen opposite say that officers will canvass the soldiers. Well, it is not our fault if the bulk of the officers who have gone to the front from this House are Conservatives. Surely the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), who is in the firing line to-day, cannot be blamed for being over there. Nor is it any more reprehensible that the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Carrick), who is also at the front, should be over there. If the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod) is at the front, he is not to be blamed for that; and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Baker) will be over there by June at all events. Surely the hon. gentleman should not complain if all the officers have come from this side of the House. I think that is all the more to their credit.

Mr. GERMAN: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that all the Canadian officers at the front are Conservatives? I can tell him that there are as many Liberal officers as Conservatives.

Mr. BENNETT: I was speaking of the members of this House who are officers in the Canadian forces. I was not speaking of the officers on the whole staff. All I can say in regard to these officers who have gone from the House of Commons is that the country will admire them more than if they had remained at home.

Mr. GERMAN: I would suggest that my hon. friend's statement will not make for unity of feeling in this country, and certainly it will not help the patriotic funds.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman has mentioned that point before. We have had elections before in this country, but after the elections people have gone back to their vocations just as usual; and surely the same thing would happen if an election were held now. I think the hon. member for Welland is looking through a glass very darkly when he says that if the Conservative party should win in an election this coming summer, the bowels of compassion of the people all over this country would be closed, so that they would not give a dollar, when requested, to the Red Cross or any other patriotic fund. The people of Canada, Liberals and Conservatives, will not be so small or so narrow as to stop contributing to the patriotic funds so long as the money is required, simply because one party or the other has been returned to power.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 11.58 p.m.

Friday, April 9, 1915.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RETIREMENT OF ACCOUNTANT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the table of the House my recommendation and his report on the subject of the retirement of Mr. D. C. Chamberlain, Accountant of the House, and of the promotion of Mr. D. W. Cameron, Assistant Accountant, to the position of accountant.

SOLDIERS' VOTING BILL.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), the House went into committee on Bill No. 111, to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise; Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1—soldiers entitled to vote:

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: It was suggested by the Prime Minister that all British subjects who are enlisted in the Canadian forces should be entitled to vote, whether or not they have attained the age of 21 years. I suggest that this section be amended by striking out the words "of 21 years of age or upwards" after the word "subject" in the first line. All those who have enlisted are doing men's work, and I think that they should be entitled to vote.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As the hon. member knows, this Bill did not come down originally as a Government measure, but was reported by a committee to whom certain of the laws relating to elections were referred for amendment. Consequently, the Bill has not received the consideration of the members of the Government as a whole which such measures usually do receive. I expressed an opintion which has just been made by my hon. friend, and I am still of that opinion. I shall be glad if the section is allowed to stand until the afternoon, in order that it may receive a little further consideration at our hands. I think there is a great deal of force in the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. OLIVER: It seems to me that this provision does not adequately define where the soldier shall vote.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: You mean where his vote shall be counted?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. I think that should be made considerably more definite than it is. As I read the section, it would seem practically to permit the soldier qualified to vote in two places to vote in whichever place he chose. I am aware that the section does not say that, but I do not see how he is prevented from making whatever choice he pleases. I would be very much better satisfied if the section said the soldier should vote in the place where he resided for thirty days before his enrollment, and let that be his definite qualification. Then we would know where we were at; but by the proviso the qualification is shifted from one leg to the other, and it is a most undesirable situation in which to find the law.

Mr. DOHERTY: It seems to me that the proviso makes it perfectly clear that if a man, irrespective of being a soldier, is a qualified voter in any particular electoral district, he shall vote in that electoral district only. He does not have a choice; he is, under the proviso, to vote in the electoral district in which he is qualified. It seemed to us in the drafting of the Bill that, as far as possible, we ought to leave things in the constituency in their normal situation and interfere with the normal situation only to such extent as might be absolutely necessary in order to carry out the provision that gives every soldier a vote. Under the clause as it stands the soldier who is a qualified voter in any particular electoral district remains a qualified voter in that particular electoral district just as though this Act had not been passed, and all that he gets out of this Act is the method furnished to him by which he can exercise that right. It seemed to us more proper that the man who is a voter in a particular electoral district ought not to be allowed to transfer himself to another electoral district. If, as the hon. member suggests, you make it imperative that all soldiers shall vote in the places in which they resided 30 days before enlistment, you make a situation where, in some particular place, where enlistment was carried on upon a large scale, you will have transferred into that electoral district from a number of other electoral districts a very large number of votes which may, under conceivable circumstances, override the vote of the ordinary voters in that district; and, on the other hand, you may take out of the electoral district to which each of these soldiers as voters belonged under the general law, a very large number of persons entitled to vote in that district. The effect of doing these two things might be to entirely modify the complexion of one or more constituencies. As far as it was possible to do so consistently with giving the soldiers a vote, we sought not to disturb the conditions in the different constituencies; and, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has pointed out, it seems to me that the policy of the section, if I may use that term, is very much preferable to a system that would make this law operate to take all soldiers who are actual voters in a particular electoral district forcibly out of that district and transfer them to some other district where they might happen to have been residing before enrollment. The clause as it stands, with the proviso, seemed to us to so operate as to cause the least possible disturbance of existing conditions, and that seems to me to be a very desirable thing.

Mr. GERMAN: It seems that the Minister of Justice has just now struck the crux of this situation which makes it bad. All his suggestions imply that an election is to

be held on the voters' list as it is at present constituted. But supposing an election is held, not this year, but on the voters' list which is prepared this year, what does he say about these absentees from each electoral district who may be on the voters' list now, but who, when the lists are revised this coming summer, will be struck off in consequence of their absence? Do these parties remain on the voters' list because they are soldiers abroad? The Bill does not provide for that. If the Bill provides that because a man may be non-resident in a district through being abroad on war service he is to be considered an elector in that electoral district, you may then possibly overcome this difficulty; but these votes will be counted on the evening of polling day, after the other votes throughout the whole electoral district are counted.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: They would all be counted at the same time, after the poll closes.

Mr. GERMAN: They cannot all be counted at the same time because the Bill provides that the returning officer is to fix a time after the poll is closed to count the vote. Every one knows that the vote is counted in each electoral polling subdivision as soon as the poll is closed. The return is immediately and as quickly as possible sent to the county town or wherever the central office happens to be. These returns would show that one candidate was elected by a small majority. As I suggested last night, here is where one of the difficulties will come in.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman misunderstands the Bill. Supposing there are twenty polls in an electoral district. Then the counting of the soldiers' ballots by the returning officer makes the twenty-first poll, and the return from it will come as quickly as the others, the returning officer himself being the person who counts the soldiers' ballots and not the deputies.

Mr. GERMAN: I may not have the superabundant ability of the hon. member for Calgary, but I think I understand this Bill and I feel very confident I understand the effect it will have. When the vote is polled the candidates or their representatives can be present and see the vote counted. When the returning officer opens the envelopes to count the votes, he sees the name of some man. What does he do? He must look over the voters' list to see whether or not that man is on the list and entitled to vote in that district. He does not find his name on the voters' list; his name need not be on the list if he swears he is a resident. How do you know whether he is a resident there or not? There is where the great difficulty and uncertainty will come, and that is the very point that will create all the dissatisfaction in the event of the soldiers' vote changing the result of the poll in that particular locality.

That is my objection to this Bill. Of course, if an election were held on the present voters' list the difficulty would be overcome to some extent. I shall be very sorry if the Government do have an election this year—and it looks as if that is what they intend—but it will certainly overcome part of the difficulty. But, if the election is not held this year, the name of every soldier on the voters' list now for any particular district will be struck off, unless there is a clause in the Bill providing that their residence shall be assumed on account of their being away as soldiers.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to follow the remarks of the Minister of Justice. While his statement of the intent of the section is, of course, to be accepted as a pious declaration, there are no means of insisting that that intent shall be carried out. The volunteer signs a declaration that he has not cast any other ballot paper, but there is nothing to show the elector in Saskatchewan or Alberta, where we have no voters' lists, whether he is qualified or not to vote in any particular locality. He could claim qualification to vote in a certain locality where he is not entitled to cast his vote, and he might do that quite conscientiously. If this is to be a legitimate attempt to count the soldiers' vote the way he gave it, there should be a definite knowledge as to where the soldier is entitled to vote, and his vote should be confined to that locality. I quite appreciate what my hon. friend said about the undesirability of unhinging the voting representation of an electoral district; but it is far better that the representation should be unhinged, and that we should know definitely what the rights of the voters are and with whom we have to deal, than that it should be unhinged just the same, and nobody should know the limitations of their rights, or how they can keep those rights within those limitations. If we have to go up against a proposition like this, in all conscience let us know exactly what we are going up against. Do not let it be a case of thimble and pea—maybe it is here, and maybe it is not.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I think I can make clear that provision has been made to meet the objection raised by my hon. friend; for I also was impressed with the necessity of making such a provision. This section was drawn with the intention of providing for two classes: it provided, first, that those who resided in the locality for thirty days prior to enlisting should have a vote in that locality; and, secondly, that those who had been continuously resident in some locality before they enlisted, should have their votes where they had always had them. I think that is what my hon. friend desires.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not urging one way or the other; but I say it should be one way or the other.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend will pardon me for saying that that is what he desired, for he does not desire anything. The affidavit as drawn did not make clear the distinction to which he has directed attention. I happened to be out of the city when the Bill was finally drawn, but I have since submitted an alternative to the affidavit on page 6, by which it will be made clear that if the soldier has resided in a community for a longer period than thirty days his vote will be counted at that place where he would have exercised his franchise had be been home. Let me take a concrete case. One of the electors in West Calgary, we will say, is voting under this Act. He will vote in West Calgary. But if he happened to enlist in Edmonton, and had resided in Edmonton for thirty days prior to enlistment, his vote would be counted in Edmonton. I am quite as anxious as my hon. friend to meet the objection he has raised; and, as I have said, we are adding a paragraph to that affidavit which will meet that objection. I realized that one could not ask for a specific provision for our two provinces, but that such a provision should be inserted in the affidavits as would allow a residence vote to be counted in the constituency in which the soldier has lived, unless his residence at the point of enlistment qualified him for a vote at that place only. Have I made myself clear?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, but the fact still remains that there is no possible means of checking the right of a man to vote in one place or the other.

Mr. BENNETT: We are introducing this affidavit into the Bill so that when the clerk of the Crown in Chancery looks at the envelope in the first instance, he will be able to allocate the votes to West Calgary or East Calgary or West Edmonton or East Edmonton as the case may be.

Mr. KNOWLES: How will he know?

Mr. BENNETT: On the back of the envelope there will be certain information to enable him to do that. When the affidavit is finally checked by the returning officer, in the presence of scrutineers of both parties, and it appears that a ballot has been improperly allotted to Edmonton, then of course it will be rejected and returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The very difficulty that my hon. friend has mentioned was anticipated by the committee, and dealt with in the manner I have indicated.

Mr. KNOWLES: How does the envelope or affidavit show to what constituency the vote should go?

Mr. BENNETT: The voter has to make in the affidavit a distinct statement of what his residence had been for the thirty days prior to enlisting, and also if he had only resided there for thirty days. He will have to say: For thirty days prior to enlisting I resided at such and such a place. And if it is a longer period than thirty days, he will have to say, for instance: I resided at 1210 Sixteenth street, Edmonton. Then it will be aparent that he resided in West Edmonton, and should vote there.

Mr. KNOWLES: Take people who are close to the line between two post offices.

Mr. BENNETT: That was traversed in the committee, and it was felt that in such a case there might be a mistake in the ballots. In some cases men have lost their votes under the existing law. But this is not the average case.

Mr. KNOWLES: I was speaking about the definiteness of the information. There will be a multitude of people who have to come fifteen or twenty miles to a post office, and who do not know what riding they are in.

Mr. BENNETT: It was felt that on the instructions there should be a note to give with as much definiteness as possible the residence, section, township and range. The very point that my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has mentioned was discussed in the committee. I myself brought the matter up, because in our western country men have to go sometimes

fifteen or twenty miles for their mail, and I thought that might cause confusion.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Government ask a great deal of us when they ask us to vote for a Bill of such a nature as this—I will not say of such a suspicious nature, because I want to be courteous—and trust to its being carried out properly because there will be a little note attached. I would as soon the note were left off, because no one knows what kind of a note it will be before it is done with. I would rather legislate in such a definite manner that notes would be unnecessary.

Mr. DOHERTY: The requirement of the Bill as it stands is that a man shall give his address. What we had in mind was his address as definitely as he possibly could give it. There can be no objection to inserting in the form that he shall give his address as definitely as it is possible for him to do. We contemplated that if a man lived in a place where they had streets and numbers he would give these or that if he lived in a rural section, he would give the section and range, so as to enable the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to ascertain what electoral district that was in. Of course, notwithstanding all that, there might be cases where a man would not succeed in giving a sufficiently definite address, and unfortunately that man would lose his vote. Under any system there are men who, through errors and mistakes, lose their votes, and all we can do is to provide the best possible machinery to enable men to secure their votes. That there will be mistakes in connection with it by which some will lose their votes I suppose we will have to admit, but I am quite ready to specify as minutely as we possibly can the information that we want each man to give.

Mr. GRAHAM: That course applies not only to the western provinces; it applies in a degree to the province of Ontario as well. In the constituencies in Ontario we have registration. There are scores of voters in many counties who are not on the list at all. They are not on the list until registration is called within thirty days of polling. Therefore, the same difficulty might arise in Ontario that arises in the West where they have no regular voters' list. If being on the voters' list is the qualification, there are plenty of young men who are not qualified in the province of Ontario. There are hundreds of young men in Ottawa from various ridings in Ontario. Does the Bill mean that these young men, unmarried, with no place of residence, whose residence is wherever they are if they are not living with their parents, will be added to the Ottawa voters' list if they have been here for thirty days?

Mr. DOHERTY: It means prior to enlistment.

Mr. GRAHAM: We want to be careful as to what constitutes enlistment.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Taking the oath.

Mr. GRAHAM: Several men went to the centres and were not formally enlisted until quite a while after they arrived there. Unless great care is exercised the result of the election in these Ontario constituencies may be altogether changed by soldiers' votes. My view is that men—particularly young men—who are at any centre ought to be compelled to have their votes registered at the place where they reside, or where they would be entitled to vote had they not enlisted at all. That situation is just as acute in Ontario as it is in the western provinces. In some of the other provinces it may not be the case, but where we have registration we have many voters who are not qualified if being on the list is their qualification. These should be protected in their right to vote.

Mr. GERMAN: Registration only applies to cities in Ontario.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: Not to towns?

Mr. GERMAN: Towns of over 10,000 or something of that kind.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it is 9,000.

Mr. GERMAN: There are large towns in which there is no registration. In Welland, which is not a city, there is no registration. In the city of Niagara Falls there is registration, and that is the only municipality in Welland county in which there is registration. Large numbers of young men have gone from Welland and other urban municipalities in the county of Welland to the war. These young men at the present time are on the voters' list, or a large number of them are. When the voters' list comes to be revised this present year, in August or September, what is to be done with these young men? They are not residents. The provincial Voters' Lists Act requires that they cannot be on the voters' list unless they are resident. Are you proposing by a clause of this Bill to say that there shall be a separate voters' list made out, which

will be called a Dominion franchise list, and which shall contain the names of the soldiers? If that is not done the names of these young men will be struck off the provincial list and they will not have a vote for the provincial legislature. Why should they not have a vote for the provincial legislature as well as for the Dominion Parliament? If these young men are at the war they are struck off the provincial voters' list, and if there is a provincial election they are debarred from voting for candidates for the provincial legislature. They have a vote in the Dominion election if they swear as to their residence.

Mr. DOHERTY: Sections 157 and 158 of the Election Act as it now stands, I think, protect a man who is prevented from being present and getting registration because of his absence on military duty. Section 157 provides that:

> Notwithstanding anything contained in any Act of Parliament or in any Act of a provincial legislature, no person otherwise qualified to vote at an election of a member to serve in the House of Commons shall be incompetent to vote at such election by reason only of his having been absent from the electoral district in which such election is held, on account of his serving with or being attached to any corps despatched from Canada for military service, or performing military service within Canada, whether as an officer, a non-commissioned officer or a private, or in any other capacity, or while serving His Majesty in any military capacity, or acting as a war correspondent in connection with any war in which a Canadian contingent is serving.

Section 158 says:

> From any oath which any person tendering his vote at such an election may be required to take, there shall, in the case of any person within the meaning of the preceding section, be omitted any statements as to residence which such person cannot by reason of such absence as aforesaid truthfully make—

Mr. GERMAN: That only gives him the right to vote if he is on the list. What about the fact of his being struck off the list in the revision? He would be struck off. He cannot stay on because he is an absentee. There is nothing in the Voters' List Act of Ontario which will allow him to stay on if he is serving at the front.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: Yes, there is.

Mr. GRAHAM: They can vote if they are on, but it does not put them on.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: They will not be struck off, because they are in the same class as sailors, lumbermen and fishermen. Their absence as soldiers counts for residence.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think there is a provision in the Ontario Act covering their case and providing that their names shall be kept on the list. I have sent for the Act.

Mr. GRAHAM: It may be that in the Ontario Act they are covered, but not in the Dominion Act.

Mr. KNOWLES: Ontario is not the whole Dominion; there are Manitoba, Saskatchewan and the other provinces.

Mr. NICKLE: A man's name cannot be struck off the Ontario list by virtue of the fact that he is only temporarily absent. So long as he retains his domicile his name goes on the list. In the particular case under review his name would go on the Ontario list by virtue of the Ontario Act; he being a sailor or a soldier the assessor must still keep his name on the list.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was not sure that the exception in the Ontario Act applied to soldiers; I know it does apply to sailors and lumbermen.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: What would happen in the case of a young man who, in the interval has attained the age of twenty-one years, but who has not been on any voters' list because while he was at home he was not twenty-one years. He could not be struck off the list by the assessor because he was not on the list, but had he remained at home he would have become a voter, in cities where there is registration.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I had the idea when I read this Bill first that it qualified every young man of twenty-one years, who is a British subject, but it appears it does not. There must be thousands of our young men serving in the forces who would not be qualified under this Bill. For example, if one of my constituents goes to Halifax and enlists at the barracks there, he may have been only one day in Halifax and not thirty days, and not being on the list in the constituency from which he came, he would not have the right to vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: He must have been in some constituency thirty days before he enlisted. He may have been only one day in Halifax but he was thirty days in Guysborough, and he would be qualified in that constituency. If you can conceive the case of a man who cannot locate himself anywhere for thirty days of course, he would not be entitled to vote.

Mr. MARCIL: There has been a large enlistment in the province of Quebec, which took place mostly in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, but in the eastern part of the province some of the men went over to New Brunswick and enlisted there. What will happen to men from rural districts who enlisted in Montreal and Quebec, and the Quebec men who enlisted in New Brunswick, who were not voters in their own ridings when they left home? Some of these men, for example, remained around Montreal for a long time, perhaps more than a month, waiting for medical examination and so on. What would happen under such circumstances.

Mr. DOHERTY: The man who came to Montreal, for example, was a voter in some other electoral district or he was not. If he was a qualified voter in some other electoral district he continues on the list, and his qualification as a soldier will be as a voter in that district. If he was not a voter in another district when he came to Montreal, and he resided in Montreal for thirty days before he enrolled, then, under this Act, he will become a voter in that electoral district in Montreal in which he resided during these thirty days. Anything he does after he has enlisted does not affect in any way the district in which he is to vote. The fact that he went to New Brunswick and enlisted there does not affect it at all, because he will be attached either to the electoral district in which before enlistment he was a qualified voter, or if he was not a qualified voter in any district his vote will be assigned to the place in which he resided for thirty days before he enlisted.

Mr. EDWARDS: I assume from what the minister says that if he was in Montreal for thirty days before he enlisted he would be placed as a voter in Montreal, but suppose he was in Montreal only twenty-eight days, would he be a voter in the part of the country in which he had formerly resided?

Mr. DOHERTY: As I understand it, he will vote in any electoral district in which he had resided for not less than thirty days before he enlisted.

Mr. MARCIL: There will be eleven ridings upon the island of Montreal next election, and supposing this man while waiting in Montreal to be enlisted shifted his residence around between different constituencies during the thirty days. I suppose that one-half of those who enlisted were young men and were not voters at all.

Mr. DOHERTY: If a man is so much of a rolling stone that he cannot find an electoral district in which he lived for thirty days, I am afraid he will have to do without his vote.

Mr. MARCIL: He may have been in Montreal for the thirty days, but he may have lived between one constituency and another.

Mr. DOHERTY: If he was in Montreal for thirty days and he cannot locate himself in one electoral district for thirty days, I fear he will have no vote.

Mr. MARCIL: Is not that an injustice to him?

Mr. DOHERTY: Would it be fair to an electoral district to allot to it a man who has resided in it only two days? We have got to get a limit of some kind, and you can conceive all imaginable cases such as are suggested where a man will not meet the requirements, but it all comes back to this: is it a reasonable requirement to ask that a man should be thirty days in an electoral district in order to look upon him as so attached to that district as to entitle him to vote there? The pointing out of the fact that persons who do not comply with this disposition will not get votes, does not seem to be an argument against this provision of the Bill. If the provision be open to criticism, I should have thought it would come from the direction that thirty days was not long enough, and not from the point of view that because a man has travelled from one electoral district to another during the thirty days he will not get a vote. Under the franchise law in the provinces generally, some period of residence much longer than thirty days is required for a man to get a vote in that district. A man may have lived in Montreal for years, but if he is like the supposed soldier of my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) and has been flitting from one to the other of the electoral districts, so that he has not lived the precise period in any one district, such a man would have no vote. For the benefit of the soldier we have reduced the required period of residence down to what I think is a fair minimum. I do not think we could be expected to meet the case of a man who has had no local habitation for a period of thirty days.

Mr. VERVILLE: The Montreal lists are made, as the Minister of Justice knows,

every two years in December. Regardless of a man's length of residence in the district, if he has a domicile even for one day prior to the date when the lists are made out, if he registers he is on the list and entitled to vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: Does the hon. gentleman say that he need not have any period of residence in the district?

Mr. VERVILLE: He resides in the city of Montreal. But suppose that the day before the 20th of December, when the lists are made out, he moves from one district in Montreal to another district in Montreal. He registers, giving his domicile at the number and street to which he has moved. He goes on the list, and in any election after that he votes as domiciled at that street and number, no matter where he actually lives.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is quite true. Everybody who is on the list to-day is a competent elector for the next two years in the district upon whose list his name appears.

Mr. BUREAU: Suppose that a man is on the list in the city of Montreal, that list being good for two years. That man moves to a rural district where a revision takes place every year in September. He has his principal residence in the rural district. Will the minister tell me that that man has the right to vote in Montreal?

Mr. DOHERTY: Under the law as it stands you have the principle of one man one vote, and a man is not entitled to cast two votes.

Mr. BUREAU: Then, where will such a man vote?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman is putting forward something of a conundrum.

Mr. BUREAU: But the law solves that conundrum. It says that a man votes where his principal place of residence is.

Mr. DOHERTY: Is that material to our present question? I did not come here this morning prepared to determine all the possible questions that might arise in all the laws of all the provinces. But, in answer to the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), I would point out that, eliminating the case of a man who has become a voter somewhere else, and dealing with the people who live in Montreal, the man who is to-day on the electoral list of a particular electoral division of Montreal, is a voter in that division for the next two years. If he presented himself at the poll, his name would be found upon the list, and, subject to objection that might be taken by reason to his being entitled to vote elsewhere, prima facie, he is a voter in the electoral district. Therefore, so far as the city of Montreal is concerned, and the flitting of people from one electoral district to another within the city, I do not think there is occasion to apprehend difficulty in the application of this Act. A man who has gone to the front has not gone to a rural district and acquired a residence. So, the case the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) suggested can hardly arise.

Mr. BUREAU: The families of those who have families may move: the residence changes.

Mr. DOHERTY: My hon. friend is tackling a very large question now. There is a very material difference in meaning between domicile and residence.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, I will use the word "domicile."

Mr. DOHERTY: I must decline to enter into a discussion upon such very fine points as the definition of what constitutes domicile and what constitutes residence. If this Bill is to be dealt with, it must be dealt with realizing that after all it will have to operate under the law as it stands. I do not pretend to be able to indicate in advance just how, in exceptional and individual cases, it may operate. But, speaking generally as regards the city of Montreal, and the man who to-day is on the list and goes to the front, I am satisfied you will not find as many as one-half of one per cent of cases in which these men will not continue to be qualified electors in the electoral districts upon whose lists their names appear. So, with regard to the people moving from one district to another, which is the case presented by the hon. member for Maisonneuve, I do not think there is any practical difficulty.

12 noon.

Mr. VERVILLE: There are a great many soldiers in Montreal at the present time. They come from many different places. Prior to the passing of this Act they will have been more than thirty days in the city of Montreal. They are living in different parts of the city. I am sorry to say that very often they do not live thirty days in one place. I do not like to say why, but I know that it is so. What position would these

men be in? Are they to have the choice where they shall vote?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand the hon. gentleman is speaking of men who, having enlisted, reside in different districts. I would point out that what takes place after enlistment has no bearing on the question. Thirty days after enlistment, or a year after enlistment, does not affect the matter: it is prior to enlistment.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What force does the hon. gentleman give to the word "immediately" in relation to residence? If a man is twenty or twenty-five days away from his ordinary residence, can he swear that he resided in a certain place for thirty days immediately before the date of his enlistment?

Mr. DOHERTY: Where does the hon. gentleman find the word "immediately"?

Mr. SINCLAIR: In the affidavit, page 6.

Mr. DOHERTY: The section does not make the requirement that it should be immediate. The affidavit was apparently copied from a form in the present statute, and I do not think that that word "immediately" should appear therein. However, that will be a question to be considered when we come to deal with the form itself.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The latter part of this section reads:

> Provided that if any person was, at the time he was so appointed, enlisted or enrolled, qualified to vote in any other electoral district in Canada, he shall vote in such other district only.

The question I raised was as to the position in which a young man would be, who, at the time of enlistment, was not enrolled or qualified to be enrolled, but who, between the time of his enlistment and the time of the election, qualified for enrolment. I have a son who, though he was not 21 years of age when he enlisted, is 21 years of age now and is away from the electoral district to which he belongs. How will this provision apply to young men between the ages of 18 and 21 who have enlisted—and there are many of them—and who may in the meantime have become properly qualified to vote if at home?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no doubt that, under the conditions which the hon. member indicates, the young man in question, when he enlisted, was not qualified to vote in any electoral district. The proviso does not entitle him to vote in any particular district, because he was not qualified to vote there at the time of enlistment. Under the section as it stands, that young man could become a qualified voter only in an electoral district in which he had resided for 30 days prior to his enlistment. I would fancy that in the majority of cases the district in which such a young man resided 30 days before he enlisted would be the district of his home. There will be cases where that is not so, but hon. gentlemen will remember that the 30 days is a period not before leaving this country, but before enlistment.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Immediately prior to enlistment.

Mr. DOHERTY: It need not necessarily be immediately prior to enlistment; the section of the Act does not say "immediately." I think possibly it may require some little consideration as to whether that word "immediately" should stand in the form or not. Under the operation of this section, a young man in the position mentioned by the hon. member would not have the right to vote in his own home district, because he was not a qualified voter there when he enlisted.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If he should go abroad, he would not be entitled to have a vote anywhere.

Mr. DOHERTY: He will have a vote if he had resided for thirty days immediately before enlistment in some place in Canada, but if you leave out the word "immediately," which is a matter that I should like to have stand for further consideration, then a man who fulfilled this requirement twenty years ago would be entitled to vote.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am speaking now of young men who have just attained the age of twenty-one years, of which there are quite a number at the front.

Mr. DOHERTY: According to the present provisions, a young man who has lived thirty days in Canada will have a vote. I do not think that we can secure that that young man's vote shall be in the district of his home, unless the district of his home be the place where he has lived during the required period. We have two classes to deal with: persons who, when they enlisted, were qualified to vote, and persons who, when they enlisted, were not qualified to vote. In respect of the latter class, I do not think that we can do any better than

give them a vote in the place where they had their residence for the thirty days. The others will have the right to vote in the district in which they are qualified to vote. I think that in the majority of cases it will work out that the provision will give the young man a vote in the place which is his home.

Mr. KNOWLES: The right hon. Prime Minister this morning intimated that he is in sympathy with the suggestion that votes should be given to minors who are at the front. The reasons given for that are the reasons which were elaborated so fully yesterday afternoon and evening, namely that this Government has such a responsive and appreciative feeling for the boys at the front that nothing is too good for them. Hon. gentlemen opposite spoke in eulogistic terms last night of the lads who have gone to the front, in support of the view that any one who is fit to carry a gun surely is fit to cast a vote. If hon. gentlemen opposite accept the view that lads of 16 and 17 should be entitled to vote, I suggest that there is just as much reason for giving the suffrage to the nurses who have gone to the front as there is for giving it to lads under 21. Many persons believe that all women who have reached the age of 21 years should be given the suffrage. We heard hon. gentlemen on the Government side slobber over the soldiers last night; the Prime Minister pointed out how disappointed the fathers and mothers would be if this privilege were not granted to the soldiers. It is my belief that the Prime Minister cares not so much for the mothers as he does for the fathers and brothers, especially those who have a vote. I am not going to slobber over the nurses; enough slobbering was done yesterday. I contend that girls and women who risk their lives to perform work that men cannot do, for the good of their country and the honour of civilization, have just as much right to vote as lads of 16 and 17 have. I myself am not very far from being a supporter of woman suffrage, but I shall not raise that question on the present occasion. I do say that if you are going to give the vote to boys of 16, 17 and 18, you should give it to the girls who have gone out there to do this great work. Surely a cheap, slobbering desire to get votes is not all that is left to us; surely we are gallant enough and chivalrous enough to say that votes shall be given to these women as well as to the boys and men. If the Government are going to go ahead with this burlesque measure, they should take it into their serious consideration whether they should not give votes to these women who, in many cases at great sacrifice, have gone to the front to carry on this noble work.

We in the Dominion of Canada would then stand out before the world as showing our appreciation in a very unique way, not in a vote-catching way—because I think the women would not vote as the Minister of Public Works has suggested, but would vote pretty squarely, and I do not think you could monkey with their votes—and would do itself credit by thus showing its appreciation of the women who have gone out, especially in the Red Cross work, and would thus encourage others to enlist in that noble service.

Mr. DOHERTY: I gave credit to the hon. gentleman for not having slobbered over the nurses and also for a disinclination to monkey with the women's votes. I further take note of his request that the Government should take the suggestion into consideration, and beg to assure him that the Government shall give it its most serious consideration.

Mr. VERVILLE: While we are speaking on this question of giving votes to young men who have not reached their majority of 21 years, because they are going to the front, we should remember that there are other young men who have not gone to the front, but who are possibly as useful to the war as those who have gone. You will find many young men to-day who are supporters of families, who are working in different factories, making shells and other things that are necessities of war; and if you are going to give the right to vote to these young men because they are going to the front it is absolutely unfair not to give it to other young men here of the same age. You will find such young men in many industries to-day throughout Canada, even on the farm. I do not care where it is, these young men are producers of different things that are keeping our soldiers at the front, whether they are producing money to support the affairs of the country or manufacturing different articles that are necessary for the war. If we want to be fair we should not give the vote only to young men who are going to the front. Lower the limit to 18 years if you like, but give the vote to these other young men.

Mr. DOHERTY: I would ask the hon. gentleman to give a little further explanation of his position. The suggestion to give votes to young men under 21 years of age stands for further consideration this afternoon; but, because I would like in that consideration clearly to apprehend the view of the hon. gentleman, I would be glad if he would tell me whether I am correct in understanding that he does not consider that the alteration in the Bill withdrawing the requirement of 21 years should be made; or does he think that we ought to do it with regard to the soldiers and also with regard to the other young men he speaks of?

Mr. VERVILLE: My suggestion is that if we are going to grant the vote to soldiers of less than twenty-one years of age, we should also grant the vote to other young men in the country who are also working for the war.

Mr. DOHERTY: I really would be glad to know what the hon. gentleman's view is as to the desirability of giving votes to soldiers who are under twenty-one years, because that is a matter that we have to consider practically. I understand he says if we do that we ought also to give it to other young men. But I would be glad to know whether he thinks we ought to do that.

Mr. VERVILLE: The Government can give the vote as much as they like; it makes no difference to me, provided they make no exceptions and are fair with everybody.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If there is to be any enlargement of the scope of the Bill to include parties not now mentioned in it, I think the minister ought to consider the case of the sailors who are engaged in the mercantile trade of the North Atlantic. At the present time that is a very dangerous pursuit. Everybody knows that a ship cannot arrive at a British port to-day without risking the lives of her crew. That service is almost as dangerous now as service in the navy or in the trenches. I know of many young men who are manning our ships which are carrying food and supplies to the Allies at the present time. They sleep with their clothes on, with the boats hung over the side of the ship ready to jump into them, they are expecting the torpedo to strike their ship, all through the long night. It is a most anxious time with those men, and if the Bill is to be enlarged so as to take in parties not now included, I would suggest that the Government ought to consider the cases of those thousands of men engaged in the mercantile service on the Atlantic ocean.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the difference between enlistment and enrollment? A recruiting officer was sent from New Brunswick into my constituency. He visited different parishes and took the names of a number of people who did not actually move away with him, but who ultimately left, and, when they had undergone medical examination and other formalities, were included in the forces. What is the difference between enlistment and enrollment? Is this to be reckoned from the date the recruiting officer first appeared in the constituency or from the date on which the engagement was completed in New Brunswick, perhaps some weeks afterwards. It would make a difference as to whether the voter would belong to his own county or to the new county.

Mr. DOHERTY: The 30 days are counted as from the appointment, which I understand is the proper term for any person joining the force as an officer. I must confess that I am not absolutely clear on the terminology, but I understand that when a man first presents himself he is enlisted and takes an oath. After he has undergone medical examination and complied with other formalities he is then enrolled. It might perhaps have been sufficient to mention enlistment only, but I presume there might be a case where a man would be immediately enrolled for one reason or another and this was only to make quite certain that the 30 days is to date from whichever event occurred first.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: I think it might be advisable for the Minister of Justice to take the opinion of the Militia Department on the use of these words. As I understand, as a practical man with some experience, a man is enlisted when he first signs. In order to complete his enlistment he has to pass the doctors and certain preliminaries. He has to take the oath of allegiance. Then he signs his name to the service roll and that completes his enlistment. The adjutant puts his name on the book and it is sent to headquarters. He then becomes a regular member of the militia, his term of service is three years and he becomes liable to military law. I rather think that the word " enrolled" should be struck out. It is superfluous and does not add to the meaning or to the strength of the section.

Mr. DOHERTY: I would be very glad to act on the suggestion of the hon. member; I have no doubt his description is correct. Subject to the verification by the Militia Department of the suggestion made it would seem to me that the word "enrolled" probably is superfluous. It was doubtless put in there as a result of too much precaution. Certainly the intention is that the 30 days should be before whatever is the first step in making him a soldier.

Mr. MARCIL: When he gives in his name.

Mr. TURRIFF: I wish to draw the minister's attention to one class of men to whom it is proposed to give votes under this Bill. A British subject living in the United States may make up his mind to go home to England to fight with the British army. He has been some time away from England, and has no vote there. Although he has lived in the United States for a long time, he has not taken out his papers, and so has no vote there. Before he goes over to England he learns that the Canadian soldiers are paid $1.10 a day, while the soldiers in Britain are paid only 25 cents. So he crosses the border with the intention of joining the Canadian forces. But he is delayed for thirty days in this country before he enlists. This man is a British subject who had originally intended to join the English army. He has no particular interest in Canada except that it is a part of the Empire. He has joined the Canadian forces in order to get the better pay, which he is perfectly justified in doing. Now, because that man happened to live in Canada for thirty days before enlisting the minister proposes to give him a vote. I appeal to the minister whether that is a reasonable thing to do. The man knows absolutely nothing about Canadian politics.

Mr. DOHERTY: Even if that be a very great evil, I hardly think it will happen in a large number of cases.

Mr. TURRIFF: Not in many cases.

Mr. DOHERTY: We have always to make laws under which we are going to find hard cases that will come up. Almost any law it is natural though perfectly just in its application in the great bulk of cases is liable to give rise to anomalies in isolated cases; but I hardly think that that is a reason why we should not be prepared to adopt a law that in the great general sense will give a vote to the man who is a Canadian and a member of the Canadian forces. After all, what we do is this. We assume that the man who becomes a Canadian soldier does so because he is interested in Canada; he gives the most tangible, prima facie evidence of interest in Canada. There may be an odd man who joins the Canadian forces to get $1,10 a day instead of the 25 cents which he would get in Great Britain; and if we could get at the motives of every individual man perhaps we ought to make a distinction and not give that man a vote. But I suggest that it is not a practicable thing to draw that distinction, and, after all, no material evil can result from a few isolated cases such as my hon. friend has mentioned. After all, the hon. gentleman speaks of him as a man who wants to fight for Britain. Well, in this particular condition of affairs the man who wants to fight for Britain, and **fights** for Britain, wants to fight for Canada, and is fighting for Canada.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister given any consideration to the hundreds of Frenchmen living in Canada who are now fighting under the French flag? There have been hundreds of these men in Montreal. They are British subjects, but descendants of French parents. I could name hundreds who have been called back to fight with the French army; members of the Bar and of almost every other profession have gone back to France from Montreal. The city engineer of Montreal, Mr. Janin, who was through the whole campaign of 1870, is going back now at the age of 62. Has the minister given any consideration to this class of men?

Mr. DOHERTY: Consideration has been given to it. Although the gentlemen indicated may have become naturalized, they are undoubtedly people who, under the operation of the different laws in the different countries, find themselves with a double nationality; otherwise they would not be called upon to return to the colours of France. Finding themselves with that double nationality, and recognizing their obligations as citizens of the French Republic, it seems to me that we cannot do otherwise than assume that they have made their choice as between these two nationalities. I am not criticising them for having done that, but they have done it. Being entitled to be French cittizens or British subjects, or both so far as they can consistently be both, when the time comes for action they choose to range themselves as French citizens.

Mr. MARCIL: The cause is the same.

Mr. DOHERTY: The cause is the same, but if we are going to give votes to all who are fighting for that cause we shall have to extend the Bill to all the soldiers in all the armies of the Allies. It seems to me that the action of these men has settled for the time being what is their national status, and while I should be glad to recognize in a proper way the fidelity that these men have shown to their original country by returning to take their places in the ranks of its army, I hardly think that the proper way of recognizing that fidelity would be to give them the franchise of the country which they have made clear that they consider, as between the two, the secondary country. There would be this further difficulty in the way. We do not propose to give a vote to the man in the armies of Great Britain who may have some connection with Canada. In dealing simply with members of the Canadian forces, we have the advantage that we are dealing with men who, while they are serving as a part of the Imperial army, are men organized as Canadians, and organized to a very large extent, though not entirely, under Canadian officers. We are dealing with organizations with regard to which it is more easy for us to create a system which we can hope to have carried out, than if we endeavoured to ask for co-operation on the part of officers of the armies of totally different countries—countries which, though our Allies, and though we respect them as such, are nevertheless absolutely distinct countries.

Mr. MARCIL: I should just like to say a word for the Belgian colony in Montreal. I do not wish to add anything further to what I have said about the French reservists, except to say that these men are Canadians and will come back to Canada after the war is over. The same thing applies to the Belgian colony of Montreal, which sent over 1,000 men to Belgium. These men have taken part in the campaign, but they will lose their votes simply because they are not members of the Canadian forces.

Mr. THOBURN: This Bill opens up a question that I have discussed with friends of mine for some time past. I should like to ask the Minister of Justice if there is any clause in this Bill dealing with what might be called absentee voters. There are thousands of voters in the Dominion of Canada who are disfranchised, who have no vote, simply because they do not happen to be in the locality; they have left their homes where their names appear on the voters' list, they have moved away perhaps one hundred miles. They are bona fide voters who have lost their votes because they have moved to places where there is no registration, and there is no registration except in cities or towns of a certain population. A workman who is away from home, for instance, has no vote where he is located, he cannot afford to pay his way back to vote at his own poll, and the candidate is not allowed to pay his expenses. The consequence is that the man is disfranchised. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice is putting into force machinery to record the votes of the soldiers who may be in the trenches, but I am perfectly satisfied that very much more simple machinery would suffice to record the vote of the man who is still a resident of Canada, but who, from the fact of his being a distance from home, is unable to record his vote. There is another case even simpler than that to which I have referred, and that is the case of a man who moves out of one county to an adjoining county, and he happens to move out of the county in which he was a resident after the voters' list is completed. He moves into the new county too late to be placed on the list in that county, and when the election takes place he is disfranchised. I am satisfied that the minister could put a clause in this Bill to deal with the absentee vote, protecting the right of the bona fide voters who have not moved out of the Dominion. They have their residence in some part of the Dominion, but owing to their having moved away and not being able to pay their expenses back home they are disfranchised. The same thing applies to the man who has moved out of one county into another and who, because he is too late to be put on the voters' list in the county into which he has moved, is disfranchised.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no doubt that there is very much in what the hon. gentleman has pointed out. The adoption of his suggestion would result in the establishment in this country of laws similar to those which have been enacted in a number of countries providing special provisions for the absentee vote, or as it is sometimes called the postal vote. In looking into different matters in connection with the present Bill I must say that I have formed a very favourable impression of the possibility of such a provision being carried

out. The measure which is now proposed is the first step in that direction. Perhaps it might very properly be said that the reasons for providing for this method of voting in this particular case are stronger than they are in support of a general system, but this is one step in that direction. We are providing a method for the absent voter, and if this should work out as satisfactorily as we hope it will I certainly would be disposed to look very favourably upon some measure to remedy the evils which the hon. gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. OLIVER: Some time ago, when questions were put to the Minister of Justice as to the effect of this law as applied to the different voters' qualifications in the different provinces, he brushed the matter aside by saying that he was not going to undertake to describe the limitations or applications of the law under all possible circumstances.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think that I brushed it aside, or that I would not pay attention to it. It seemed to me that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) was rather refining the distinctions and I said that I did not come here, and that I did not pretend to be prepared, to deal with all the niceties and distinctions of the law. I said that I was endeavouring, of course in a general way, to make this law so operate as not to produce anomalies by reason of the conditions of the laws in the different provinces. I shall be very glad to have anything pointed out to me in regard to the law of any province which might call for a modification of any provision of this Bill.

Mr. OLIVER: Perhaps the minister has misunderstood the point I was trying to get at. I do not wish to criticise what he said but I wish to take his expressions as giving the main reasons for the criticism that I find against his Bill and particularly against this section. It undertakes to define certain rights. It defines them, if I may say so, in a very indefinite way as will be found to be the case when these definitions come to be applied to the different conditions throughout the provinces. That this is the best that can be done, we admit, but that being the condition, the circumstances under which the vote is taken, absolutely preclude the ordinary safeguards that guarantee both to the voter who votes, and his fellow citizens, that his vote shall be cast according to the rights that he holds. On these points the minister does not feel himself able to present any opinion to this House and therefore the individual voter is the sole judge of his action in regard to them. That is not a fair proposition. That is not right. It is essentially wrong that it should be the case. In the ordinary circumstances of the election law, in the first place, the right of the voter is defined as definitely as words can define it. Beyond that there is a procedure laid down guaranteeing to the electors generally, as well as to the voter, that while he shall have the benefit of the rights conferred upon him by the Act, he shall not go beyond those rights —he shall be kept within those limits. That is not possible under the conditions set out in this Act; at any rate, there has not been provided that machinery, that procedure, to safeguard the public against the misuse of the right of the franchise. The voter himself is the sole judge as to where his rights shall rest. If the Minister of Justice finds difficulty in deciding on that point, how much more is the voter liable to take a view that is not warranted by the law and is not according to the intent of the law? My hon. friend may ask: What is the practical objection to it? The practical objection is this: In his earlier remarks, when we were discussing this proviso, the minister pointed out very clearly and very properly that it was the object of the law that there should not be an undue disorganization of the strength of the voting population, that matters, in so far as voting was concerned, should remain as much as possible as they were. That is perfectly right but by reason of the indefiniteness of the law in prescribing the exercise of the right of the franchise it will be entirely possible to mass the votes in this direction or in that in large measure and so produce that very disorganization which the minister stated was undesirable and which it was the purpose of the law to avoid. That is to say, the minister has undertaken to deal with a vastly important subject and he has not provided the machinery to deal with that subject according to the principle he himself has laid down. He may answer that it is impossible to provide that procedure, and that is the very point upon which we take issue. We say that if the rights of the franchise are not to be exercised with due regard to the right of the public as well as to the rights of the voter, then the right of the public should prevail.

Mr. DOHERTY: In the hon. member's own province, if one of these soldiers were

at home, he would walk into the polling-booth and he would swear to his own qualification, and to his qualification in a particular district, and he would then be allowed to vote.

Mr. OLIVER: Sure.

Mr. DOHERTY: Now, we are requiring of that same soldier voter, who happens not to be at home, that he should swear to these very same things. The criticism of the hon. member of the sufficiency of the safeguards for the soldiers voting as proposed by this Bill, apply absolutely to the safeguards provided under the general law with regard of the votes of the voters in the province of Alberta. So far as that province is concerned, we require from the absent soldier all that would be required from him if he were at home and voted. As regards the other provinces where there is a system of lists established, there is a method of checking the statement of a man who is a qualified voter in a certain district. I do not think there is any less safety in the respect pointed out by the hon. member in the manner in which this soldiers' vote is to be taken than there is in the manner in which the ordinary vote is to be taken in certain parts of the Dominion. There was a suggestion made by the committee which had the consideration of these election matters that the law under which a man may give his vote in Alberta by merely swearing to his qualifications should be repealed, and when that provision came to the House we found that the opinion of all the members from that province, and a large number of others also, was that under the conditions in that province it would not be fair to repeal that law, and that in order that a man should be fairly treated there, it was essential that that principle should prevail which allowed men to vote upon their own affidavits as to their own qualifications. Surely the conditions under which our soldiers find themselves ought to be considered sufficient to justify that the same principle be applied in their case.

Mr. OLIVER: I am sorry to prolong the discussion, but I am compelled to point out that in the case of the ordinary Alberta voter at the ordinary election there is only one question of his qualification, and all he has to answer to decide on his vote is whether he resided in a certain electoral district or whether he did not. Under this legislation the voter has two things to do; he has to decide as to whether he must vote under his term of enlistment, or under his former residence, and that is a radical and important difference. There is another difference, and it is that the voter who comes into the poll to cast his vote in an ordinary Alberta election does so under circumstances, and conditions, and procedure, framed especially for the purpose of safeguarding him in the exercise of his right, and of taking proceedings against him should he go beyond that right. There is no provision in this Act for taking the same measures of precaution in the case of the soldier voting, nor is there any possibility of such precautions being taken. The two cases are not by any means alike and the difference is so great as to warrant my suggestion that the minister has undertaken to do something that it is not possible to do. The minister has undertaken to give a right to a certain man to which he certainly is entitled, but he has to give it to him under such circumstances that he cannot protect the right of the body politic.

At one o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. McKENZIE: As I understand it, the purpose of the section now before the committee is to provide that those of the active forces abroad who are qualified to vote at the time they enlisted shall be afforded means of casting their vote. But the form of oath provided in the Bill does not seem to apply to all cases. The form of oath is "that immediately before I was enlisted in the military forces of Canada I was qualified to be a voter." But a great many of the persons supposed to be enfranchised by that Act cannot take that oath. If this law is to become operative it will be necessary to make some slight change in the form of affidavit.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman will observe that there are two paragraphs in the form of affidavit given. The first is for the soldier who is enfranchised under this Act, the other is for the soldier who is already qualified to vote in a particular district.

Mr. McKENZIE: As I understand it, it does not say anything about the qualification in the first paragraph.

Mr. DOHERTY: No, because all that is required for his qualification is that he should be a British subject, twenty-one years of age, and should have resided for

thirty days in some particular location in Canada before enlisting. If, on the other hand, he was, apart from being a soldier, qualified s a voter in a particular district, he will swear to the second paragraph, leaving out the other.

Mr. McKENZIE: It was hinted that we were able to legislate in this Parliament with regard to the men who would go to the front, but that once a volunteer goes from our shores and gets to the other side, he goes under control of the British War Office, which places him in such regiment or elsewhere as it may think proper. There is no such body known to the law as the Canadian military service. Our military forces, when they get to the other side, are scattered among as many regiments and battalions as is deemed proper. As I understand it, there is no entity in the army today which can be called a Canadian contingent or Canadian military force. I submit that the term the minister used in the Act is somewhat speculative, to say the least. If this law were one to confer the franchise upon the militia force of Canada, there is such a body recognized by the Militia Act. But the force that we send out is a force of volunteers who, of their own volition and without compulsion of the Government, became part and parcel of the British army. Therefore, I submit, we have no jurisdiction to follow the volunteer into the position in which he puts himself; we can only leave him to the control of the British army, and the British army law, until such time as he is released and comes back. I submit that Parliament is asked to legislate for a body that does not exist at all. I do not hesitate to put myself on record here—I did not speak on the second reading of the Bill—as being opposed to the measure. I believe that it is not workable and that it will only add to the difficulties already existing at the front. The soldiers when they go to the front take upon themselves certain responsibilities, and we repose certain trusts in them. They are to do the fighting for us, and we are to provide for them in every way that we can. Their minds are not to be bothered about political or municipal affairs; they must have a free hand to deal with the very arduous and important matters they have before them. On the other hand, the soldier has to trust to the friends whom he leaves behind and to the people of the country that in his absence political matters shall be kept on an even keel. As we trust them at the front, they have to trust us here. The one argument put forward is that the soldier is entitled to exercise the franchise. There may be some argument in that so far as the soldier who had the right to the franchise before he left his home is concerned. It might be said: You are depriving the soldier of the right which he would be able to exercise if he were at home. While it would, perhaps, be desirable to let the soldier who was a voter at home vote abroad, if that could be done in the right way, we are not called upon to create a new franchise in order to give votes to persons who could not vote if they were at home. I am opposed to this Bill because I do not think that it provides for a method whereby the soldiers may vote as they ought to vote. A person who expresses his opinion at the ballot box is in a somewhat similar position to the man who sits on a jury. If the minister were on the bench, and, as he was about to charge the jury, one of the jurors came in and took his place, he would say to that juror: You have not heard the evidence, and you are not in a position to give a verdict in this case. He would thereupon either order a new trial, or direct the juror, leave the box. This is what would be done in a case where persons are called upon to decide upon the facts, and an election is the highest sphere in which the people are called upon to decide upon the facts. The men to whom it is proposed to give votes are away from this country, and will be away perhaps a year or eighteen months, or two years, before they are called upon to exercise their franchise under this Act. They know nothing about the changes that have taken place in this country since they went away; they know nothing about the conduct of the Government since that time. They are deprived of the privilege of voting for the representative. A strong and eloquent plea was made the other night against granting to the man who received the minority vote in a constituency the right to take a seat in Parliament, for the reason that he was not the choice of the people. I agree, to a certain extent, with that view; yet under this proposed legislation we are called upon to give the right to vote to men who are far away from home, who are out of touch with the issues that will be threshed out in an election, and who have no knowledge of the qualifications of the candidates. Without taking shelter behind the assertion that I am not opposed to voting by soldiers, or behind any other shelter, I say that I am absolutely opposed to this

Bill, and, so far as the soldiers who are my friends at the front are concerned, I take the responsibility of telling them that I do not think that this legislation is right or necessary. I am sure that the soldiers are not asking for it, and do not expect it.

Section stands.

On section 2—distribution of ballot papers:

Mr. GRAHAM: The soldiers may be divided into two classes, those who are in Canada and those who are outside of Canada. I see no reason why the soldiers who are in Canada at the time of an election cannot vote under the ordinary machinery and subject to the ordinary restrictions and regulations that are now in force. There is no reason why the deputy returning officer should not take the votes of the soldiers in the different localities in which they are stationed, and forward them to the constituencies to which they belong. Take the city of Ottawa: there could be one or two polls for the soldiers only. The votes could be recorded by the deputy returning officer, under the usual conditions and subject to the usual safeguards as now provided, and afterwards be sent to the proper constituency. There is another feature of this matter to which I think the attention of the minister ought to be directed. Several of the officers to whom these ballots will be sent for distribution and who, under this Act, will take the votes of the soldiers, are now or will be candidates for election to this House. It is not impugning their honesty, or anything of that kind, to point out the anomaly that will exist if men act as returning officers and handle votes that are cast for or against themselves. I imagine that no one of the officers to whom I refer would care to be placed in a position of that kind, and I think that some provision ought to be made by which in no case shall an officer who is himself a candidate be a returning officer or have anything to do with the ballots. These are the two points which I wish to impress strongly upon the minister in connection with this section of the Bill.. First, there is no need for all this machinery for the casting of the votes of soldiers who are in Canada; they could be taken with our ordinary machinery without removing any safeguards; and, secondly, no man should be allowed to handle ballots who is a candidate in an election.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is much that commends itself to one's judgment in the suggestion made by my hon. friend with respect to soldiers who are at home. In the committee we endeavoured to deal with the soldier vote as a whole and it is possible we did not give sufficient attention to the difference in methods necessary for those at home and those abroad. Would the hon. member contemplate that soldiers, say at Quebec or Halifax, whose votes would have to be sent to distant electoral districts should vote on the election day or sufficiently before the regularly appointed election day to allow of their ballots reaching their destinations by the polling day?

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not think out the details, but personally I would see no objection to having a polling day for the soldiers which would be sufficiently early to permit of their ballots reaching their home constituencies before the regular polling day. Of course it would be all secret and no person would know anything about the ballots until the close of the general poll.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The difficulty pointed out in that scheme is that in some cases it would be physically impossible for the soldiers to vote after nomination day and still have their votes reach their home electoral districts on election day. In most parts of Canada the matter could be worked out, but there would be great difficulty in regard to Vancouver troops who might be at Halifax, and it would be impossible for the votes of Victoria soldiers who might be at Halifax to be cast after nomination day and be received in the home constituency before polling day. It could be worked except for constituencies west of the Rockies.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would work out with the great majority of voters anyway.

Mr. DOHERTY: I suppose the vote might be taken on nomination day?

Mr. BENNETT: There was some discussion as to their knowing who the candidates were.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am opposed to this Bill, more particularly to clause 2, because I do not see any possible way in which the votes can be taken fairly so that there can be any certainty that they will be delivered as cast. Let us look for a moment how it works out in particular constituencies. In Edmonton the Conservative candidate is the commanding officer. Does the Minister of Justice think that it would operate satisfactorily in a case such as that, where there are hun-

dreds of men brought in from the surrounding constituencies of Alberta, a great many of whom will be there long enough to qualify in Edmonton, but who will also have votes in their home constituencies? These men could vote in Edmonton by securing a half-day off on election day, go out in civilian clothes, take the oath that they were voters in Edmonton, and so cast their votes there. Even granted that a commanding officer who was a Conservative candidate would not care to act as returning officer for his own election, he would appoint somebody under him in the military force to do so. Let me ask, in all candour, is there a man in this House on either side who would want deliberately to put the ballots for his election in the hands of any candidate opposed to him, to let him deliver them or not deliver them just as he saw fit, without more safeguards than have been provided in this Bill? The more the Bill is discussed, the more utterly and absolutely absurd it seems to expect that the votes will be delivered and counted as they were given. If I was reasonably sure that the vote as cast would be delivered, I would hold up both hands for this Bill. I have a large number of men from my own constituency at the front, two out of three of whom are supporters of my own; but, under the circumstances, scattered, as they may be, in Turkey, Egypt, Bermuda, England, France, Belgium, and I hope in Germany, I would not have one hope in a thousand that their vote would be delivered in Canada at the election as they were intended to be. Who has asked for this legislation, might I ask the minister? We have not been able to hear yet of anybody who has done so. Has any section of the army, has any section of the militia forces asked for this legislation? For my part I do not believe that the Government has any expectation that this will ever become law; and it is all done to enable them to wave the flag that the Liberals were against allowing the soldiers to vote. We are not against allowing the soldiers to vote, but we are against allowing the Government to count the votes after they are cast. The Prime Minister yesterday spoke of the difficulty of getting honest elections in Canada. Let us talk plainly. We know on both sides of the House that there is a great deal of difficulty in getting the votes counted properly, with all the restrictions with which the best men in the country have been able to hedge about the Election Act during the last 50 years. We know what the results are. My right. hon. friend yesterday made some remark on that line which I will read to the House:

> I recall that with all our safeguards and legislative provisions, a deputy returning officer and a poll clerk went forth in one of our western provinces, pretended to journey into the north 100 or 120 miles, but went in reality only 20 or 30 miles, where they sat down under a tree, filled in 150 names, deposited as many ballots, and came back with the story of a unanimous Liberal vote in that remote part of the constituency. It is impossible to prevent fraud absolutely by legislative enactment.

I think my right hon. friend would have done himself more credit if he had told the whole truth in that connection. We all know that the Liberals suffered by the barefaced rascality which was practised on that occasion. That was the first and only time in the history of Canada that a Government deliberately brushed aside all technicalities. They would not call for a new election when they could have won easily, but they took steps to hand over the seat to a Conservative candidate.

Mr. BRODER: They simply gave back the stolen goods.

Mr. TURRIFF: Certainly, but did hon. gentlemen opposite ever suggest doing anything of the kind? Only last summer three constituencies were absolutely stolen in the backwoods of Manitoba, and the candidates were all confirmed in their seats. There was no restitution there of the stolen goods, not a bit of it.

Let me tell my hon. friends what took place in my constituency in the last Dominion election that hon. gentlemen opposite had the running of. That was in 1896. At that time we had almost the same system of voting that we have at present. The Elections Act did not contain the provision that enables a man to cast his vote on election day whether his name is on the list or not, the provision which the Minister of Justice and my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) suggested should be struck out only a few days ago—and I quite absolve both of them from having any wrong intention in making that proposal. Several days before the election took place, and after the ordinary pen and ink lists for the polling division had been posted up, men were sent out from the Conservative headquarters in Moosomin to instruct every enumerator throughout the constituency to strike off the list a certain percentage of Liberal names. These men were sent out by the men in charge of the Conservative campaign in that constituency. One of these men, whom I know

very well, went to one of the Conservative enumerators in my constituency and suggested that he should strike off 25 per cent of the Liberal names on the list. The enumerator, as straightforward a man as ever lived, absolutely refused to do it. He sent for me and told me what had been suggested. He said that he told me not because he wanted it blazed abroad, but that my friends in the other divisions should be on the look out for trouble. What happened at the next polling subdivision? The enumerator there, the night before the election, struck off twenty-five Liberal names, and then cleared for parts unknown; so that the next day there was nobody to put the names on the list again. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson), who was in the same constituency at that time, knows something about it, for he had a somewhat similar experience. When polling day came there was almost a riot in the next town to where I live. They had a rope ready for the enumerator, and if they had found him they were going to drag him through a pond close to the town. But he could not be found. I must say, however, to the credit of the Conservatives in that polling subdivision that we did not lose many votes through it, for afterwards man after man told us that they voted for the Liberal candidate because they would not stand for such work as had been going on.

I point this out to show that with all the safeguards we have, it is possible that an honest vote may not be recorded. What can we expect then when the vote is taken thousands of miles away, when the men at the front are not so likely to be as careful as they would be if at home, and when the commanding officers are in many cases candidates! Suppose the commanding officer hands over the work to somebody beneath him who is looking for promotion and wants to stand in with the powers that be. What is likely to happen? So far as I can see, this Bill provides no penalties for the man who does not send in all the votes, or who misdirects them. There are many ways in which the intention of the voter at the front could be defeated. The more you look at this Bill the more difficulties you see in it; it simply bristles with difficulties from one end to the other. Why is the Minister of Justice so anxious to give votes to the soldiers? He knows that 35 or 40 per cent of the voters of Canada do not take the trouble to vote anyway, and I am sure that some of the soldiers who are to be provided with votes would not take the trouble to vote if they were at home. On the other hand, many no doubt would like to vote, even at the front, and I for one would like to give them the opportunity of voting. I would hold up both hands for any Bill that would ensure that the votes would be counted as the voters intended.

Again, no hon. member of this House has yet shown that there has been any considerable demand from any part of the militia for soldiers' votes. There is one certain and easy way of getting over this difficulty. Why does not the Prime Minister do the straightforward, honest and patriotic thing, and say that there shall be no election until the war is over, or until the end of the term of Parliament. Nobody would object to that, and if the war was not over when the end of the term of Parliament came I venture to say that every man in this House would be willing to extend the term of Parliament until the war was over. To my mind, it is an outrage to throw this country into the throes of a general election right in the middle of this war, when every bit of energy in the country is required for conducting that war properly. In this easy way the Prime Minister and his followers could settle the whole difficulty. Why do they not do the decent and patriotic thing, and tell the country straightforwardly that there shall be no election before next session at all events? We have every reason to believe that in a year from now the war will be over and our soldiers back in Canada. But I think that hon. gentlemen opposite do not want the soldiers to have votes when they are back in Canada They would rather not have the votes of the soldiers when they come back. A good deal has transpired in the last two months that could lead one to take that view. Therefore, we find the Government anxious to railroad this Bill through the House to give votes to the soldiers and at the same time to provide practically no safeguard which would justify us in the expectation that the votes, as they are given in the firing line, will be delivered in the constituencies where the men come from in the way intended.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Turriff) make the statement that he is strongly in favour of votes for soldiers. I find that a great many hon. members on this side of the House are in favour of votes for soldiers. The difficulty seems to be to provide the necessary ma-

chinery to have the votes taken and also to provide the necessary safeguards. It does seem to me that there is sufficient legal ability in this House to draft a Bill that will provide the necessary machinery as well as the safeguards.

With some diffidence, I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) certain changes. I approach this question with an open mind. These suggestions have just come into my mind to-day, and it may be that they will be found to be very crude. Sections 2 and 3 perhaps ought to be considered together. They provide for the casting of the votes. Section 2 provides that the envelopes for holding the votes shall be sent by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the officer in command of each military base in Canada in which volunteers are serving and also to the office of the High Commissioner for Canada in London. Then, section 3 provides that, on the election being called, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall communicate with the officer commanding the corps in which the volunteer is serving and that the commanding officer shall provide each volunteer with a ballot paper. That is for the men in Canada. As regards the men in Europe, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall notify the secretary of the High Commissioner of the issuing of the writ and the secretary shall thereupon send a sufficient number of ballot papers, affidavits and envelopes to the proper officer or officers, and such officer or officers shall give each volunteer entitled to vote a ballot paper, affidavit and envelope.

The provision in regard to the duties of the commanding officer are very crude. We have to consider what men are entitled to this vote. First, we have the body of men in Canada. We will have under training in Canada about 20,000 men; they will be scattered about—10,000 at Valcartier and perhaps 5,000 at two other camps. Surely some simple means could be provided for taking the votes of these men in camp. The machinery ought to be simple and effective for that purpose. Next, we come to the votes of the soldiers in England. We are told that we will have at the base in England 20,000 men. The men in England, with the exception of those who are in the hospitals, are altogether in one place, under efficient military organization and under the control of our Militia Department. The third class comprises the men at the front. I am told by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major General Hughes) that we have 38,000 men at the front and that number will be raised shortly to 50,000 men. Our men at the front will be in two divisions. They are now in one division. That division is under the command of General Alderson and the Canadian officers and staff under him. These men are assembled close together or within a very few miles. With these men all together, or within a very limited area, there should be no difficulty in taking their votes. Many of my friends who have spoken say that these men are at the fighting line. We are led to believe that these men are engaged absolutely in battle night and day. I am told, and you will see it in the reports that come from the front, that trench work consists of one day in the trenches and two days out of the trenches. If they put in two days in the trenches they have four days out of the trenches. They go back to the base, where they are assembled, and there should be no difficulty while they are there in taking their votes. Of course, I can see that there will be a number of men whose votes it might be difficult to take, but we have to face that fact.

I think the machinery provided under sections 2 and 3 is defective. You start right off, and, as soon as the election is announced, you say that the secretary of the High Commissioner shall take action. What shall he do? He must give instructions to the officers commanding the different corps and units and send them ballot papers, and they are to carry out these instructions. We know that no civilian can give instructions of any kind to military officers. We know that the military officers at the front could not possibly take any commands, orders or instructions from a civilian like the secretary of the High Commissioner. That would be impossible. Then, remember how difficult it would be for him to find out who are the officers commanding these different units. It is very difficult. For example, in England there are the hospital corps, the army service corps, the paymaster corps, the divisional corps, the artillery, the ammunition corps, cavalry, and what is called the base or recruiting camp. You have all these different units divided into many different parts and having amongst them many commanding officers. It would be almost impossible for the secretary of the High Commissioner, in the short time allowed him to get the necessary information and even to get the proper postal addresses. By the time he got the inform-

ation changes might be made. Then there is this further consideration: he has not been in the habit of communicating with the officers commanding the different units; he has not been transmitting information to them, and he has not been receiving reports from them.

It may be asked: how can we work this out effectively? It would seem to me that we have the most perfect machinery possible provided for us now. The Militia Department, or the Militia Council, have control practically of all the Canadian troops in England and at the front. Our paymaster's department is a Canadian department. The paymaster's department, now that it is in proper working order, has proved to be most efficient. They have to communicate directly with every officer commanding the different units and they have to directly put the pay into the pockets of every man at the front and of every man in England. This is a direct channel of communication, not only with every officer commanding every unit but with every man in Canada, at the front or in England. Pay is the most effectual way of communicating with the men. We have there a perfect channel of communication under proper direction.

It has been said that it would not be necessary to have this legislation, if the Prime Minister and the Government would say that no election should be brought on until after the war. I have a firm and honest belief that the Government of this country will not have an election until after the war. I believe their duty at the present time is to carry on the business of the country, but their first and prime duty is to prosecute this war with their full energy and all their ability, and to allow nothing to interfere with that. They have the precedent of England for the adoption of this policy. I am glad to have seen that the Opposition has given to the Government during this session, and during the special war session as well, every assistance in their power to conduct public business without party controversy. But there is this to be considered: suppose the war should end in a year, and a truce be declared, we know very well that our troops would have to stay in Europe after that, for five or six or perhaps eight months, as in South Africa they had to remain for almost a year. Until all the preliminaries are carried out, the indemnities arranged for, and the treaty entered into, our soldiers could not return to Canada, and in the natural course of events, the time for a general election would come before then.

As I have said, the Militia Department has the most perfect machinery and the most perfect channel of communication to reach effectually every man and every officer at the front. We have provided the soldiers with their clothing, and we are providing their pay, and when promotions are made by General Alderson, he reports at once to the Militia Department here, and every detail at the front is practically arranged through the Militia Department in Canada. My suggestion then is, that the ballot papers should be sent to the secretary of the Militia Council, and that there should be imposed on the Militia Council the duty of forwarding these ballot papers to the proper officers, because they know the commanding officers of the different units, their location, and everything about them. The Militia Council could give the necessary military instructions that would be promptly obeyed by the officers of the different units, and then the ballot papers could be returned sealed to the Militia Council, to be handed over to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. This, Sir, is my suggestion.

4 p.m.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have heard with interest the admirable suggestion made by the hon. member (Mr. H. H. McLean). I had in mind, when we come to the section which describes the officers to whom the ballots are to be sent from the Secretary of State, that the officer on the other side who is in the best position, as I have been informed to have these ballots effectively transmitted to the bases where they can be used, would be the chief paymaster of the Overseas Canadian Expeditionary Force. He is an officer already appointed, and he would do this work ex-officio, and not because the Government has selected him. Those of us who have been concerned with the introduction of this Bill have been most anxious, so far as possible, to make its operation independent of personal selection by the Government, and the utilization of the machinery of the paymaster's department would operate to make an officer, and not a particular individual, the intermediary through whom these ballots would be forwarded. I know that during this discussion very improbable and far-fetched grounds have been invoked to base suspicion upon, and if we were to designate the Militia Council to be in any way connected with controlling the return of the ballots, it might give rise to the suggestion that in some way or other the Govenment would be enabled to control the

selection of particular men. I am anxious to avoid that, so far as I possibly can, and to my mind it might be better not to utilize the officers of any department of Government to return the ballots.

Let it be assumed that whatever machinery we devise here—and we are ready to adopt any well-reasoned suggestions in that respect—may sufficiently secure a genuine vote by the soldier, then it is my belief that once you get that properly sealed into the post office to be transmitted to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, it will be the safest way for the ballots to be returned here. I think that the fewer people through whose hands these ballots are going to pass, the better it will be. Every day we send through the post office things the secrecy of which is most important, and once you get the ballot properly marked and properly deposited in the post office, it is to my mind the best way to secure its not being tampered with in any way. Then, it being addressed to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, when it reaches him here it is in the hands of a responsible officer. It comes to him sealed—and I propose to make that more absolutely clear—and verified, so far as such things can be verified. It is made his duty to put that in a sealed package. He seals it with his own seal, making a package for each electoral district, and he forwards it either by mail or by special messenger to the returning officer; and the returning officer has to produce that in a sealed condition in the presence of the candidates or their representatives. The returning officer puts these ballots in the ballot-box, just as the deputy returning officer puts other people's ballots in the ballot box, and that returning officer will count those ballots. The hon. member for Assiniboia says that all he objects to is the Government counting the ballots. Where he finds in this Bill any provision for the Government counting the ballots, I must say, passes my comprehension. The ballots will be counted by the returning officer. Other ballots are counted by the deputy returning officer. Surely, the returning officer is as much to be trusted as his deputies are. In effect, this is just one more additional deputy returning officer who is the returning officer himself. He will count these ballots at the close of the poll. It was suggested this morning that the provision of the Bill that he shall count these ballots at the close of the poll did not mean, as it does in other Bills, at once after the closing of the poll. We will make that clear. So, the only difference will be that at five o'clock in the afternoon of polling day, say in the hon. gentleman's constituency, if there be soldiers' votes, those votes will be counted just as other votes will be counted, in the presence of the candidates or their representatives. Surely, it is impossible to suggest that the Government is going to count the ballots.

So far as those ballots getting back to Canada is concerned, one thing strikes me with regard to the suggestion that they come through the Militia Department or any other department. I would like to avoid even the semblance of these ballots after they are marked being in any way in charge of the Government as a Government. The election is in charge of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. He is not our instrument in any way; his duties are clearly prescribed. As to that part, I think the hon. gentleman should absolve us from the suggestion that we are trying to "count the ballots."

Mr. TURRIFF: In using the expression "counts the ballots" I had not in mind the mere fact of ascertaining the number of the ballots for the several candidates after the close of the polls. I was thinking of the whole course of collecting the ballots, forwarding them and counting them,—the whole proceeding from beginning to end.

Mr. DOHERTY: Will not the hon. gentleman admit that the one thing the Government has to do is to reach a determination as to the man on the other side who shall take the ballots and post them? I do not understand the hon. gentleman to suggest that the Government controls the Post Office; I hardly think he will suggest that. We are trying to meet any difficulty that may be raised by putting this into the hands of a permanent official who must be trusted with everything that has to be done with regard to an election. Let me say further that any other suggestion, short of refusing the soldier his vote, that will tend to prevent the Government from having any control of this operation, I will accept with great pleasure, and I am satisfied that my colleagues will endorse me in that statement.

The hon. member who last spoke (Mr. H. H. McLean) has pointed out that there is no necessary connection between this Bill and an election now or later. He has given a very good and conclusive reason for that. Might I point out another? We dealt the other day with the Elections Act. Did anybody come forward and say: Unless you are going to have an election

there is no use of amending the Elections Act? The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) last year, before the war began, moved for a committee—and we were very glad to assent to that motion—to consider and improve the Elections Act. Did anybody suggest that that hon. member must have come to the conclusion that an election was to be held right off and that otherwise he would not have proposed the amendment of the Act?

There is only one question here—we cannot get away from it; we always come back to it—and that is: should the soldier have a vote, and should the machinery for registering that vote be provided? If he should not have a vote, we should not do anything about it now or later. If he should have a vote, now is the time to provide the machinery by which that vote can be registered. What other class in the community would stand for it, if, being entitled to a vote—and I am assuming for the moment that this is admitted in relation to the soldiers—and if the law as it stands did not provide the necessary machinery, they were told: There is not going to be an election at once; there may be no election, and therefore it is not necessary to do anything? If there is a right there should be in the law means provided for the exercise of that right. As to the suggestion that the Prime Minister should say that there will be no election for a certain length of time, I can hardly see how hon. gentlemen can be serious in such a thing. Is the prerogative of the Crown to dissolve the House if conditions require it to be renounced for a definite period? Yet, that is what hon. gentlemen are asking for.

Now, to come back to the objections made to the details of the Bill. If I followed the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff)—and I do not propose to discuss with him past stories of scandal; what we are concerned in, I believe, is how we are going to make this proposed legislation effective—he suggested that a soldier in barracks in Edmonton, might, under the existing law in that province, and without legislation at all, take the necessary oath and register his vote. I quite recognize that that is possible. Before the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) made his suggestion, in considering the matter I had come to the conclusion that there should be added to this Bill a provision that nothing contained in it should prevent the soldier, in a case where he found himself in a position to do so, from exercising his franchise in the ordinary manner, and, further, that when he found himself in that position, he should so exercise his franchise. This would make it quite clear that this Bill is to apply only to the class of people to whom it is intended to apply, that is, persons who, by reason of their military duties, are prevented from exercising their franchise in the ordinary way. I do not propose to ask that this section be passed at the present time, because I recognize fully the value of the suggestion made by the hon. member for South Renfrew. I want to put the operation of this proposed legislation, so far as it is possible to do so, in a position where even a suggestion of improper control by anybody may be rendered an impossibility. So also do I wish to make this Bill operate to give the soldiers a vote with as little disturbance as possible of the conditions that surround voting generally. If we can find the means whereby the vote of the soldier at home may be taken at polls, or at other places appointed for the taking of such votes where the soldiers are stationed, and the ballots then distributed to the electoral districts where they belong, I shall certainly be very glad to modify the Bill so as to bring about that result. That would reduce the danger pointed out in the method suggested absolutely to the case of men who are overseas. With regard to that, I am glad to have the suggestion for the hon. member for Sunbury and Queens (Mr. H. H. McLean) and I shall be glad to have any suggestion from any member that will provide further precautions with which to surround the giving of that vote, and more particularly that will aim to meet the suggestion that there is any possibility of this Government in any way manipulating or countenancing or conniving at manipulation of the ballots.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend, in the course of his observations, stated that the Government could not make any declaration as to the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown with regard to dissolution. I have not uttered a word up to this time upon this subject, nor do I intend to do so. The Government will have to take their own course with regard to dissolution, and, when they dissolve Parliament, whether it be this year or later, the people will be the judge as to whether the reasons for dissolution were or were not sufficient, and whether that course was inspired by patriotic motives, or by motives which were not patriotic. As to the exercise of the prero-

gative of the Crown, and the assertion of my hon. friend that the Government cannot be expected to make any statement on this point, I want to take complete issue with him. It has been done elsewhere: it has been done, more or less formally, in England. The statement has been made, though not formally, that there was no cause for an election; that it would be better to have no election during the war. This statement has been made by ministers and by members more than once in England. But this Government, the Government of Canada, have again and again declared to the people that there is no occasion to exercise the prerogative of dissolution. Not later than last year this was done by the Government. My hon. friend will recall that a statute was passed some years ago by Parliament providing that in the province of Manitoba the election lists shall be prepared every year by a board of judges. The same statute provides also that in the unorganized districts of the province of Ontario a board of judges shall prepare every year, in the months of July and August, the electoral lists. This power is to be exercised mechanically by the board of judges, without an injunction from the Government, but the exercise of that power may be dispensed with by Order in Council passed by the Government. An order was passed last year that there should be no revision of the electoral lists in the unorganized portion of Ontario and in the organized polling districts in the province of Manitoba. The Government last year, therefore, intimated that there would be no election. This being the case, there is no reason to believe that the Government may not be called upon to give an intimation as to whether or not the prerogative of dissolution shall be exercised. I repeat that, whether we have dissolution or whether we do not have dissolution, the action of the Government will have to be judged when the time comes.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have a profound respect for any opinion on a question of this kind emanating from the right hon. gentleman, but I entirely fail to see why a provision made by the statute, and the exercise by the Government of the power conferred by that statute, in any way implies that the Crown or any responsible ministers advising the Crown can bind themselves that for a certain period of time, without regard to what conditions may arise within that period of time, they will not perform what those conditions might make it their duty to do. I have already seen, as emanating from the right hon. gentleman, a statement that the fact that the Government exercises the power which it has to exercise some time in the month of June or July, if my memory serves me, whereby it dispenses with the making of the lists for certain districts, binds the Government and the Crown that for a year after that there shall be no dissolution of the House. I must confess that I cannot see any ground for drawing that conclusion. I presume that it would be a fair inference that when a government in the month of June or July, or whatever is the period within which it may do so, does exercise the power of dispensing with the preparing of the lists, it does so because at that time it does not anticipate that there shall be an election. But to conclude from that, that for a year to come the Crown has forfeited its prerogative right to dissolve Parliament and that the ministers have become relieved of what the conditions in the country arising after that action might make it their duty to do in the way of advising the Crown, I must say seems to be an absolute non sequitur. Surely it would be a less deplorable consequence of the exercise of that power that a limited district in the country might, perhaps, find itself without lists than that for a year the Crown's prerogative should remain in abeyance, and that no ministry, no matter how imperative might be the reasons for giving that advice, would be free to advise a dissolution of Parliament. I have great respect for the right hon. gentleman's views, but I certainly cannot concur in that. The right hon. gentleman says it has been done before, but I notice that when he referred to what had been said in England he said "not formally," and that what was said in that country was that there was no occasion for an immediate dissolution and perhaps no cause for dissolution there until after the war. I made no reference to any statement of that kind; I was referring to what I understood to be called for by different gentlemen last evening—an assurance that there would be no election for a certain period of time. I am expressing no opinion whether there ought or ought not to be an election; I only desire to point out that it seems to me that so long as we are going to continue to be governed in accordance with the constitution, no such undertaking can be properly given.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not know that I wish to contradict very much of what

my hon. friend has said. I do not contend that the fact that the Governor signs an order to dispense with the necessary formalities for an election is binding upon the Government that there is to be no dissolution; but I say that my hon. friend himself has given the interpretation of that act. It is an expression of the opinion of the Government that there is no cause for an election. Of course, even after the Government have taken such a course as that, occasions may suddenly arise which may compel dissolution, but my hon. friend will agree with me that when the Government dispense with the necessary formalities which must take place before an election, it is a statement to the public that, in the opinion of the Government, there is no cause for a dissolution, and a subsequent dissolution could not be justified unless a new cause compelling a dissolution had arisen which did not then exist. That is the point which I make, and therefore I say that the Government has more than once stated its opinion that there should be no dissolution. It does not follow that there might not be a dissolution if the power of dissolution exists at all times; but it has to be exercised on proper occasions and under proper circumstances. All I say to my hon. friend is that when the Government, as they did last year, pass an Order in Council dispensing with the formalities which must take place in Ontario and Manitoba before an election, no dissolution should take place unless there is a cause which did not exist when the order was passed. Something new, something which could not have been foreseen, might cause a dissolution. That is all the Government can undertake. To-day the Government can declare that they see no cause for an election, or that they see cause, or they may say nothing. That is their prerogative and their privilege. I do not ask the Government what they will do; it is their own secret; they may do what they please; but if they dissolve or do not, whatever action they may take, they will have to account for it to the electors; and if they dissolve, they will have to give a sufficient reason to the electors to justify a dissolution.

Mr. TURRIFF: I can give an instance in point. Last year, when the Legislature of Saskatchewan was called together for what was known as a war session, the programme was laid before the House and the leader of the Opposition in the legislature asked whether, if the Opposition concurred in everything and went in for a short session and brought up none of the subjects that are usually brought up in an ordinary session, there would be any certainty that there would not be an election before another session of the legislature was called. The Prime Minister of Saskatchewan promised absolutely that as far as he could see there was no intention whatever of having an election, at least until after there was another session of the legislature.

Mr. DOHERTY: That only proves that the Prime Minister of Saskatchewan and I do not agree upon this subject.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: It is immaterial to me and perhaps to others when the elections are to be held or whether they are held at all. But it is utterly absurd for any person to suggest, at a time when we are endeavouring to pass a measure to give votes to soldiers who are at the front that there should be no election until after the war is over. This Act contemplates an election during the war.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: There is no doubt about it. What is the use of the measure if no election is likely to be held.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: Hon. gentlemen applaud. I tell them they are wasting their time discussing this measure if there is to be no election and no chance of an election during war time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: We do not know how long the war will last, but the Bill cannot be made of any use unless an election takes place during the war. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to be very much afraid that there will be an election.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Not at all.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: I can recall an occasion two years ago when they kept us up here night and day trying to force an election when we were endeavouring to prepare for this war. We endeavoured at that time, as we all remember, to do our share towards naval participation in the war that we saw coming.

Mr. OLIVER: That you saw coming!

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CLARK: We were then within a year or two of the previous election, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite were determined to have an election at that time. But they do not want an election now, two years later. The position they take seems to me to be absurd.

Mr. KAY: Does the hon. gentleman think we should have an election this year?

Mr. CLARK: I am not concerned whether we have an election this year or not. I said at the start it was immaterial to me when we had an election. The objections that I have heard so far to this measure come from hon. gentlemen who are suspicious that something crooked is going to be done in the taking of votes at the front.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: I cannot understand the fury and vehemence of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), backed up by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who appear to be exceedingly suspicious that something crooked is going to be done in connection with the counting of the ballots. The one thing that these gentlemen ought to suspect most is their own suspicion. There is absolutely nothing whatever in it, and no justification whatever for that suspicion. I would like to know what the Conservative party has done, what this Government has done, to justify any such suspicion. The Conservative party has not conducted a federal election in this country for twenty years. Every federal election in that time has been under the control of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentlemen composing this Government have never been guilty of any such actions as would justify hon. gentlemen opposite in suspecting that they were conniving at anything in the way of crookedness in connection with this vote. Not only that, but if we take into consideration the Redistribution Bill passed last year, and the fair and just way in which it was made, I think hon. gentlemen ought to give a little more consideration to the Government. As far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I say the Government waived a great many legitimate advantages that they could have had from a redistribution.

I do not think that hon. gentleman opposite have any reason to complain about the redistribution, and I do not think they do complain about it. I think it is only right that they should give this Government credit for fairness in regard to redistribution; and the way that redistribution was made should convince them that the election will be conducted fairly and squarely. In the province of Ontario the Conservative party has been in power for ten years, during which time three elections have been held; but not one single charge of crookedness at elections has been made against the Government; not one protest has gone to trial; there has not been one solitary charge of ballot-switching or crookedness at the polls during all that time.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: What about the ten years previous?

Mr. CLARK: I do not want to refer to the past. I do not like the suspicions and insinuations of hon. gentlemen opposite against the officers who are to take the vote at the front. I do not see an hon. gentleman opposite whom, if he were an officer, I would not trust with ballots cast in my favour. I do not believe that there is any more justification for suspicion against the officers at the front than there is for suspicion against the gentlemen in the Dominion of Canada who will be appointed returning officers and poll clerks. These officers at the front are not only officials of the Government for the purpose of taking the vote, but also officers in His Majesty's service; and I have every confidence that the vote will be taken properly, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite ought to have the same confidence.

I agree with the hon. member for St. John that the question bristles with difficulties; but these difficulties can be surmounted, and the discussion in committee is bound to have that effect. I think all of us will agree that the soldiers should have votes; it is therefore our business to see that they get votes. Proper safeguards must surround the voting so that no crokedness can take place. But I am not apprehensive that there will be any bogus ballot boxes or anything of that sort, and I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite should have any suspicions in that regard. I have the greatest confidence that the officers who will be appointed to take the vote will conduct it properly.

Mr. NESBITT: I have not been in the House very much for the last few days, and have not heard much of the discussion. I did, however, hear the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) speak last night. The other day I asked the Minister of Justice if there had been any demand for this Bill from the soldiers themselves. Although I did not think it was a very serious question, the Speaker thought that it was, and ruled it out of order; and the minister did not answer. I understood the hon. member for Calgary to say last night that 12,000 men had enlisted from Calgary,

and that every one of them had demanded the vote.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I said that 12,000 had enlisted from Alberta. If I said that they had all demanded the vote I certainly did not intend so to state. I said that a very large number of the men that I knew had asked that that provision should be made. Of course I do not know the whole 12,000.

Mr. NESBITT: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I understood him to say that they had all come from Calgary, and had all demanded the vote; and it struck me at the time that that was very different from what had occurred in my section of the country. So far as I can recollect, about 300 men enlisted from the city of Woodstock and district. One of the contingents has gone to London, another to Guelph, and the first went abroad. I have met many of these men on the street in Woodstock, but not one of them has suggested that he would like to have a vote; nor have I had any post-cards, letters, or communications of any description from those who have enlisted from Woodstock asking for a vote. I do not say that they would not accept the privilege of voting if they had the opportunity. But I have been wondering where the demand for this Bill came from. If I were at the front, I think I should be kept busy dodging bullets; I should certainly dodge as many as I could.

I notice that the first section of this Bill provides that the soldiers will have the right to vote for a certain electoral district. I would like to point out to the minister that a good many of the men who enlisted in Woodstock do not live there. I understand from the papers which give the news of the recruiting that many came from the south riding. I think that a lot of the members of the last contingent enlisted in Tillsonburg or Ingersoll, which are both in the south riding. I know that a number of those who enlisted in Woodstock for the first two contingents are not familiar with our expressions with reference to elections. For instance, a number of these men would not know the difference between the south riding and the north riding. I am not jealous of these men having votes. I would have no objection whatever, if we could be sure that the votes would be counted exactly as the soldiers wished them to be counted. I am pleased to say that many of the native-born who enlisted from my section of the county are friends of mine anyway. But we all know that most of those who enlisted from Western Ontario were natives of the British Isles. They have a perfect right to vote, so far as I know, and I think most of them have been in this country long enough to be entitled to vote and so far as Woodstock is concerned, I think most of those who enlisted would have registered if they had been home at the time of the election. I see that section 1 provides that a volunteer shall be entitled to vote who has been a resident of any place in Canada for a period of not less than thirty days. If my memory serves me right our law requires a residence of three months in a locality.

Mr. DOHERTY: The provincial law requires a longer period than thirty days.

Mr. NESBITT: Somebody has said that there would be no necessity for this Bill if it were not the intention of the Government to bring on an election. Whether that be true or not I shall leave to the committee to determine. But, if a number of these men are still in Canada, there is no reason why they should not be voted in the ordinary way. Why should they not be sent back to their own districts? Take districts like Guelph and London; there is no reason why these men should not be sent back to poll their votes.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). earlier in the afternoon, made a suggestion looking to provision being made that those who are still in Canada should register their votes in Canada. That would apply to cases where they were near to their own districts. The suggestion was also made that where they were a great distance away we should arrange to take their votes at the places where they may be encamped subject to sending their ballots back to their districts. I do not propose to ask that this particular section be adopted until that suggestion has had the fullest consideration, and I hope we will be able to adopt a system which will substantially meet that view.

Mr. NESBITT: I did not hear my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), but in reading the Bill I could not see any reason why something of the kind could not be done. As to the man actually in the fighting line, we know that the people of this country are very strong on sentiment and are very eager to provide everything for the soldier. Now we see that the minister is going to provide votes for them. We have been diligently providing every-

thing that is required to eat or wear and we have been very anxious to contribute in every way possible to their comfort. I cannot conceive that these men either in England or at the front will be worrying themselves about the election if an election comes on. They will have other things to engage their attention if they are really at the front and on the firing line. However, personally, I would have no objection to their voting if it can be done in a feasible way. My hon. friend will readily appreciate that even a person with a non-suspicious mind like I have—rather a stupid one—would not very much like some commanding officer to have the absolute control of how men were to vote either at the front or in Canada. The minister, for whom I have a sincere regard, can quite well appreciate that even people of a non-suspicious mind would not like to be put in that position. We all quite agree with the hon. gentleman who spoke a moment ago that the officers in command of these men are honorable. I know a good many of them who are highly honorable. Still, you know that in politics there is an awful temptation to get the better of the other fellow if you can. There is small blame attached to a person who does that. While I have a high idea of the officers at the front, they would, after all, have the control, practically speaking, of how the men in their regiments were to vote. Nobody would be brutal enough to say to his men that they must vote this way or that way, but they would suggest in some way that would be kindly how the men could vote. You cannot drive a man, but you can coax him very readily. There is a strong objection to having the votes taken in the way proposed. I am not, as I said, of a suspicious turn of mind, but really, is it not asking a good deal from both sides of this House that the officer in charge, whatever his politics may have been before he went to the front, should have the absolute say and control as to how the men under him should vote? That only applies to the men at the front or in England. It strikes me, and I am glad to see that it has struck the minister in the same way, that it would be absolutely unnecessary to provide for voting in that way with respect to the men who remain in Canada. I am glad to see that the minister agrees with the position I take on this matter.

We have all been anxious to close the session and get away home. This session has not been long in comparison with ordinary sessions, but there seemed to be a feeling in the air when we first came here that the session would be of a non-partisan character. Sometimes it has drifted down to party discussion. Last night it was very strongly on the border line of straight party discussion. We all came here with the idea that it would be a short session and that we would get home early. When we thought we had everything done this Bill came up. It gives special privileges to a class of the community even if this class is made up of soldiers whom we all honour. I am glad to see that everybody does the same. I dislike, personally, hot-air loyalty. Hot-air-and-champagne loyalty never did go down with me worth a cent. I dislike to hear it, but I have no doubt that we are all ready to acknowledge our indebtedness to the soldier who has gone to the front to risk his life. I confess quite freely that I am too big a coward unless I had to do so, but I have a great appreciation of the fellows who do. I endeavour to do my duty as nearly as I can in other ways. We are going to pass a Bill here that gives a special privilege. Is it asked for? If it is not specially asked for, why press it? If it is asked for, let us sit down and work out how the soldier can get a vote if he wants it. If he does not want it why bother with it? What demand has been made? If there has been a demand what kind of a demand has been made?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two with regard to the last remark made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). He claims that this is a special privilege that we are giving to a section of our people. I claim that it is not a special privilege, but it is simply giving them the same rights that we who remain at home exercise.

Mr. NESBITT: The ordinary registered voter has to be three months in the locality, this provides thirty days. That is the special privilege that I was referring to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am glad to have some explanation from the hon. gentleman, because he repeated the remark that it was a special privilege. Thirty days' residence in this country applies only to British subjects. If that is the distinction that he, made, I am glad to learn that that is what he meant.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend will also recognize that he and I can only vote where we live.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: And we can only vote once, and without this very legislation our Canadian soldiers, who, above all others, have the highest sense of their duty to their country and to the Empire, would be deprived of votes. It is to that I take exception. We have heard during this session talk about frauds being perpetrated on the country, and about injustice having been done to our solders, in the matter of their equipment, and, Sir, that is one important reason why, to my mind, the soldiers on whom these wrongs are alleged to have been perpetrated should have an opportunity of expressing their views. At all events, the fact that the Government has introduced a measure of this kind is evidence that they are not afraid of the votes of the soldiers, and that they believe they have treated them justly and fairly from the very first day they were mobilized in Canada, and since they have been placed side by side with the soldiers of the Empire. We have heard much about the boot scandal, and those of us who saw the men at Valcartier, trudging in the mud and the wet—

Mr. MACDONALD: I rise to a point of order. I submit that it is not open to my hon. friend to discuss the boot question, which is before a committee of the House.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh.

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman opposite will have all the opportunity he wants to discuss the boot question when the report of the committee comes down to-morrow.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The very fact that these investigations have been held is to my mind sufficient justification for extending the franchise to the men who best know all the circumstances. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) have expressed themselves as being very suspicious that some wrong would be perpetrated if the Government should have supervision over the votes of the soldiers, but has not the Government in office always had supervision over elections, and are they not held responsible in every instance for the manner in which the elections are conducted? We are doing in this case simply what is done in all other cases with respect to elections. I most emphatically declare that if any men are to be deprived of the franchise it should not be the men who go to the front to fight our battles, and who have the highest conception of their duties and responsibilities to their native land. There have been appeals from hon. gentlemen on the other side that no election should be held during the continuance of the war, but whether we will it or not an election may become necessary, and it is only in the event of an election taking place when these men are at the front that this measure has been introduced. The obstacles which some hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to conjure up against this Bill are purely visionary. I wish anything I might say could convince these gentlemen that the officers in command of our troops are honourable and responsible men, and I have enough confidence in them to believe that the vote to be taken at the front will be the purest vote cast in any election throughout the length and breadth of the Empire. I have the most absolute confidence in the men who are facing death in the trenches for our sakes, and I would be ashamed to refuse to place the utmost responsibility in their hands.

5 p.m.

The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) has taken exception to the vote being given to men who have been in Canada for a few months only, and he says they cannot understand the issues in an election. Let me point out to him that these men will be voting for or against the Government, and not on the individuality of the candidates. I believe in that respect a fairer test of public opinion may be secured than in the ordinary case where two candidates are voted for, one of whom, because of his personality, may command support from the electors which does not represent the feeling of the community on the policy of the party he supports. It is in my opinion more desirable to have a fair test of public opinion on the issues before the people, than it is to have a test of the personal standing in the community of individual candidates, and in that respect I can see many advantages in taking the vote for or against the Government, or for an independent candidate, as the case may be. I did not intend to offer any remarks on this subject nor would I had not the discussion been so prolonged. I could not imagine that there would be a man found in this House who would take any serious objection to giving the franchise to the men who are to-day in arms for the defence of the Empire. I know that from many constituencies a large number of men have gone

to the front, but I am thankful that I have never concerned myself about what their political affiliations may be. I have heard some persons express the opinion that most of the officers are of the Conservative faith, but I do not agree in that view and I hope it is not so. I do believe that in the appointment of officers there has not been the slightest discrimination made on political grounds. The first intimation I had that war had been declared between Great Britain and Germany was from an officer in my county who called me by telephone and asked me to announce at once to the Minister of Militia that he offered his services to go to the front in any capacity that might be desired, and I assume that he was but one amongst hundreds of the officers of the active militia. I believe, Sir, that there are many Liberal officers at the front who will be called upon to look after the method in which these votes are recorded, and hon. gentlemen opposite need not insinuate that there is going to be such a terrible danger that Conservative officers only will be placed in charge of this work.

Mr. GERMAN: The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) thinks there has been too much discussion already on this Bill, but let him remember that as to the very first clause which we have been considering most of the day, the Minister of Justice has admitted that it was presented in such a crude state that it is necessary to allow it to stand for further consideration. The discussion of the Bill has not been in vain. In my opinion, this Bill is bristling with difficulties and every section will have to be considered carefully, so that I apprehend that it will take not only to-day but perhaps several other days to get it into shape, so that the soldiers at the front, the soldiers in Bermuda, and the soldiers mobilized in Canada, can vote properly and have their vote surrounded with such safeguards as to afford that protection which every honest voter desires. The hon. gentleman, therefore, is mistaken in thinking we have taken up too much time in discussing this Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The hon. gentleman misunderstood me; I did not refer to the discussion on the details of the Bill, but to the objections raised by hon. gentlemen opposite to giving soldiers votes.

Mr. GERMAN: So far as any objection to giving soldiers votes is concerned, that was decided when the second reading of the Bill passed, and we are now in committee endeavouring to provide some workable machinery to carry it out.

I would just call the attention of the Minister of Justice to one possibility under section 2. This section provides that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall send to the officer in command of each military base in Canada in which volunteers are serving in the present war, and to the officer in command of the Canadian troops at Bermuda, the necessary ballot papers, affidavits and envelopes. As stated by my hon. friend from Queens and Sunbury (Mr. H. H. McLean), sections 2 and 3 are so closely dovetailed that they must be considered to some extent together. Has this contingency suggested itself to the Minister of Justice? The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery sends these documents to the officer in command of the Canadian troops in Bermuda, let us say, immediately after this House is prorogued—no time is fixed, and these papers could be sent as soon as printed. We understand that there are twelve hundred Canadian troops there who would have a right to vote under this Act. That officer is supposed to keep these ballots, affidavits and envelopes, in his own possession until the writ for the election is issued. Suppose, as might very easily be the case—and we must provide as well as we can for all contingencies—the officer in command of the Canadian troops in Bermuda is exchanged. He wants to go to the front, and he is sent to the front while the Canadian troops are left in Bermuda. Suppose he takes these papers with him. There is no direction as to what the officer shall do with these ballots, affidavits and envelopes. Nothing is provided in this Act, and I take it that no command from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery can affect the officer. He acts voluntarily, and he can use these papers or not, as he sees fit. Suppose a British officer is sent to take command of the Canadian troops in Bermuda, one who knows nothing about this Act. The change is not called to the attention of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. When an election is called, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery sends this cablegram: "Writ for election is issued." But the officer in command who receives that cablegram knows nothing about it; he has no ballot papers and no knowledge of this law—does not know what has taken place nor what his duties are. There is no authority in this Parliament to impose on him any obligation to do anything with regard to these papers. In that case will the vote of the soldiers

in Bermuda be taken? This section will have to be changed, it seems to me, to provide for a contingency of that kind.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are many contingencies that might be suggested. All these voters might die before the elections.

Mr. GERMAN: Does not the minister think that is rather far-fetched?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is almost as far-fetched as the suggestion of the hon. member, but not quite. The officer in command, if he is called to England, will cease to be the officer in command. He will have received these papers in his official capacity. No doubt he has other documents in charge in his official capacity. He will receive under another provision of this Bill, copies of this law. I think we can safely assume that he has sufficient intelligence and sufficient honesty—

Mr. GERMAN: I am not questioning his honesty.

Mr. DOHERTY: —and sufficient ordinary everyday common sense not to take these papers to England. Equally so I think we can assume that the new officer coming to take over the command will take possession of these documents under the law and will ascertain what his duties are. Moreover, these changes in commanding officers will be known to the department here, and we can assume that if it is necessary to communicate the fact of a change of officers, that communication will be made to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I must say I am lost in admiration at the ingenuity with which the hon. gentleman discovers things that might happen to defeat this law. There are many things that might happen to defeat the law, but I do think that there is no ground for serious apprehension in relation to the particular difficulties he suggests.

Mr. GERMAN: The hon. gentleman must remember that every contingency of that kind is provided for in the Elections Act of Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: I desire to ask the minister a question. Section 2 provides for "a sufficient supply of ballot papers in form A." Turing to form A, I find that three places are provided for marking the ballot: first, "I vote for the Government;" second, "I vote for the Opposition;" third, "I vote for the independent candidate." Is there any special reason, or was any special reason adduced before the committee, why it should read, "I vote for the Government," and, "I vote for the Opposition," instead of, "I vote for the Conservative candidate," "I vote for the Liberal candidate?" Did the hon. gentleman think it was a better lure to say "Government" and a bigger scarecrow to say "Opposition" or was there some other special reason?

Mr. DOHERTY: Speaking for one member of that committee, I can say he did not think about lures, still less about scarecrows.

Mr. BUREAU: We may think anything.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, the hon. gentleman is absolutely at liberty to attribute to the Government and to myself all sorts of schemes and contrivances which his vivid and powerful imagination may suggest. But, as he asks me the question, I answer absolutely and unqualifiedly that, as I have said, I gave no thought to lures or scarecrows. I never thought that it would make any difference to the intelligent voters for whom the ballots are intended. It evidently makes a difference to the hon. gentleman, but it never occurred to me that to the intelligent voter it would make the slighest difference whether I said "Government" or "Conservative party," "Opposition" or "Liberal party."

Mr. BUREAU: The super-intelligence that framed this Bill might be too high for apprehension of an idea that would strike an ordinary mind. Let me give the Minister of Justice a case in point. In 1911 we had a general election. In the province of Quebec we had deferred elections; one in Chicoutimi and Saguenay. Before September 21 the Government was a Liberal Government, but after September 21 the Liberal party, who had nominated a certain gentleman as a candidate, found that he had slipped through their fingers. I am not personally aware of the fact, but I was told that he had wired the right hon. leader of the Government that he wanted to be on the Opposition side until the new Government was sworn in. Practically speaking, the Liberals, although not in power, were running the affairs of the country until October. When the election started there was a Conservative and a Liberal candidate in the field. What about the case where the soldier or absentee voter votes for the Opposition and there is no Liberal candidate in the field? The hon. Minister of Justice may be witty or funny in this matter, but I want an answer to my question.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member's question was: did I see a lure in the word "Government" and a scarecrow in the word "Opposition"?

Mr. BUREAU: I did not say that; I asked why you provided for the forms "vote for the Government" and "vote for the Opposition." I must be right, because the hon. gentleman flares up at the words "lure" and "scarecrow."

Mr. DOHERTY: I was a moment ago accused of being witty; now I am accused of flaring up. Which did I do?

Mr. BUREAU: Both.

Mr. DOHERTY: Then I can counterbalance the compliment to my wit against the criticism of my flaring up, and thus dispose of both. The hon. gentleman wants to know why it is that we provide for the voting in this way. We all know under the law what the Government is, and we also know what the Opposition is. When we go to the country, the great issue before the people will be whether the Government has been administering the affairs of this country for the last few years in such manner that it is deserving of the continued confidence of the people. Therefore it seemed to me that we were providing, in as effective a way as we could devise, for voting upon the great substantial issue between the parties.

Mr. BUREAU: What about the independent candidate? He is not recognized by law.

Mr DOHERTY: We conceived that there might be a candidate in some cases who did not claim to support either the Government or the Opposition, and while the law does not deal with such candidate, that is a condition which, I think, should be intelligible to anybody without explanation. I am quite sure that the hon. member for Maisonneuve might have complained that we had forgotten him if we had not provided for an independent candidate. The soldiers, as intelligent men, will know that there may be an independent candidate who does not take sides as between Government and Opposition.

Mr. BUREAU: How would the minister act in a case such as the one which I have mentioned in regard to the election in Chicoutimi and Saguenay in 1911?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is a provision in the Act that when any difficulty or doubt arises as to who is the candidate entitled to be designated as the Government candidate or who is the candidate entitled to be designated as the Opposition candidate, the matter shall be determined by the leaders of the respective parties.

Mr. BUREAU: How would you advise the returning officers to count the votes in a case like the one which I have cited?

Mr. DOHERTY: The Government is undoubtedly the Government that goes to the country; that is the way I would decide it.

Mr. VERVILLE: One of my objections to this Bill is its provision that the voter shall vote for the Government or for the Opposition. At the next general election you may have as candidates, socialists, nationalists, labour men, who are very proud of their respective parties. It has been suggested that it is better to vote for the party than for the man. I take issue with that view; I do not believe in it. The policy of a Government is liable to change in a very few months. While the soldiers who have gone to the front may have known something about the policy of the Government when they left, if the policy of the Government changes—as a matter of fact, the policy of the Government has changed since the soldiers left—they may vote for what they believe to be the policy of the Government, but which really is not the policy of the Government. Suppose you have an election in this country and the fiscal policy of the Government has changed very materially. The fiscal policy is everything with the people; it is the fundamental basis of the cost of living. These men may vote for the Government, believing that the Government still adhere to their old policy, whereas if they knew of the change they would vote against the Government. Of course, it would be difficult to have meetings in the trenches, and as to sending literature to the soldiers, I have seen so many kinds of literature that I do not believe in it. As to the soldiers who are in Canada, I ask the minister if he will allow me or anybody else to go among the soldiers and explain what has happened during the last few months, or further back? It is not more than fair that this should be done. It has been stated that if you adopt the principle of this Bill you open the door for discussion among the soldiers. These men are entitled to know before they cast their votes what really is the policy that they are voting for. It may be said that they will be allowed to attend political meetings during

the course of an election, but I am not sure that they would be allowed to attend meetings of that kind. Besides, if the minister attempts to trespass on the rights of the Minister of Militia he will have a hard time. The Minister of Labour knows something about that; he knows what it is to try even to do his duty in respect of labour conditions when the Minister of Militia has something to say in the matter. I suppose, therefore, that the soldiers will be forbidden to attend any such meetings. In case of a general election next summer those men would not know the fiscal policy of the Government. I emphasize that, because I claim that the new fiscal policy of the Government, with the increase of tariff, is far more important than many of the people of Canada imagine. It is the basis of the cost of living, and I will explain this in my neighbourhood to the best of my ability. It makes no difference to me whether soldiers' votes are polled in my constituency. I am not in favour of having men vote for or against the Government, because, as many men on both sides of the House who will acknowledge, the personality of the candidate has a great deal to do with the result of an election. For this reason I think that we should vote not for the Government or the Opposition, but for a representative. We are voting for the man who we believe will best represent our ideas in Parliament. The man has everything to do with it. In effect this Bill says: simply choose anybody, whether he can speak or think makes no difference provided he is a man who belongs to the Government side or the Opposition side. Then if he gets a majority of the vote, under this Bill he is elected. I do not think that is right. I claim that the people in St. Anne vote for the Minister of Justice they do not vote for his party; they vote for the man, and he knows it; of course he does. Those soldiers who are in Canada should surely have a chance to vote not for the party, but for the candidate. This is very important and it seems to me that we should have a chance to speak to these men before the election. I am not speaking for myself; the Government may bring on an election to-morrow so far as I am concerned; I am ready. I have even got my lists ready; I did not even wait for the Government. Put in 500 soldier votes against me in my division and it will make no difference. I am pretty safe, so far as that is concerned. I claim that we are in duty bound to explain the policy under which the country is going to be administered in future years. That is exactly what our soldiers on the other side will not know anything about. My hon. friend knows that they are not allowed to read the papers every day. Where will they get time to read the papers? The fact is that it may be better for them not to read the papers. They are under discipline and must submit to that discipline. Then, in many cases the men may consult the commanding officer as to how they should cast their votes; they may ask him if he knows anything about the Government, what has been done, whether there has been any change in the situation. If a commanding officer is consulted in this way, what will he say? Will he say: I do not know anything about it? If he says that the soldiers may say: Well, we do not know anything either, and we will not vote. Suppose the Minister of Justice were an officer, with all due respect for him, and he had a certain number of men under his command and some man came to him and said: Officer, I would like to know something about this election: I have a ballot here and am supposed to cast my vote for or against the Government but I know nothing about it. Then the minister might be tempted. By all means let him tell the man the conditions; but it is possible that if he happened to be either a Liberal or a Conservative he would lean towards that side in his explanations. That is human nature.

Mr. DOHERTY: Would he not do that if he were at home?

Mr. VERVILLE: Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY: Is the soldier in the trenches in any different position as to voting from the man at home? Any man who happens to be a Liberal or a Conservative may say to the voter at home what he thinks about the situation. If an officer in a regiment at home were asked by a soldier what he thought, he might express his political views. Is it any worse for him to do so when he is abroad? Surely it would not be suggested that we ought to stop all conversation on political questions between the officers and their men.

Mr. VERVILLE: We must bear in mind that the officer will be indirectly a kind of returning officer. He will have the ballots to distribute and so will be indirectly a returning officer. I do not want to deal with that side of the question so much, because I know the difficulty we are up against. I would like to see a change in the provision

respecting those soldiers who will be in the country at the time of an election. It seems to me that they should have the full power to go and vote where they have a right to vote, or that the machinery should be arranged in such a way that they could be made thoroughly familiar with the real conditions and then have a chance to vote for the condidate and not for the Government or the Opposition. Why should we not give a chance for the Socialists, who are numerous in British Columbia, to vote for their own candidates? They should be permitted to vote for their own men. Then if there are Nationalists in Quebec, they should also be given a chance. We have some twenty of them in the House, that is, so-called. Let us give them a chance wherever they are. Such a plan would be more applicable to the real conditions existing in Canada to-day.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know whether the hon. member was in at the time, but in response to a suggestion of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) I did say that we would consider a suggestion which he made which looked to providing machinery whereby soldiers still in Canada at the time of an election would vote as nearly as possible as they would vote in the ordinary course. It may be possible that they would have to do that voting not in their own district, but the idea was that means should be provided to collect their ballots. As to the opportunities of soldiers of that class to hear discussions, I am quite sure that neither the Minister of Militia nor any of the military authorities would seek to interfere with soldiers attending such meetings as they desired to attend, when they were not on duty. As to the question whether they will have time from their duty to attend meetings, after all, they will be in the same position as all other employees who have to take time from their occupations to attend meetings. I am anxious that the soldier shall have every opportunity of informing himself like everybody else, and I certainly think that soldiers here in Canada would be as well informed on current events as any other men. As to the soldier on the other side, I think that some hon. gentlemen have an exaggerated idea of the absolute persistency with which he is supposed to be in the trench shooting or being shot at.

Mr. VERVILLE: I did not say that.

Mr. DOHERTY: From the point of view of his having time to read or get information, I may be quite mistaken, but I am not aware that there is any disposition to prevent information from reaching the soldier. I think hon. gentlemen have quite an exaggerated idea of the depth of ignorance of the soldier on the other side as to what is going on here in Canada. The soldiers receive letters and, I have no doubt, newspapers and other documents from their friends in Canada, and I am sure that they will be fully informed on events in this country. If any of us were away from Canada under the same circumstances as they are, we would be only too glad and happy to avail ourselves of every source of information in regard to events at home. I think that the soldiers over there will be fairly well informed as to what is going on here.

Mr. PROULX: One defect in this Bill, which has already been pointed out by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) and by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), is that it provides only for a vote for or against the Government or for an Independent; and it gives the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition power to elect representatives to this House. It might easily happen that both candidates in a constituency were of the same party. It happened in my own constituency in 1908; my opponent was a Liberal. Suppose that there are only a few votes difference between the two candidates, and that there are enough soldiers' votes to decide the election. Then the party leader has power to say which candidate shall be elected; the candidate in that case would be selected, not by the electors, but by the leader of one of the parties. This is not a democratic measure.

Mr. DOHERTY: Those soldiers have said that they want to vote for the man who will follow that leader, and that leader determines which is the man who will follow him.

Mr. PROULX: Under the British constitution and under our own, which is modelled on the British, the personal equation has to be taken into consideration. When the candidates ask for the suffrages of the electors, the electors vote for the one in whom they have confidence, and who they think will support one particular party. But still they are not sure that he will support that party; for after the candidate is elected he has carte blanche; he is perfectly at liberty to decide which party he will support. The electors, however, have

confidence in him; but under this Bill they would have to trust the party leader.

Mr. DOHERTY: If it were possible to secure a situation where all the soldiers should actually know who were the candidates, I do not suggest that under those circumstances this measure would be preferable. This method is suggested only because, as regards the men who go overseas at all events, it seemed impossible to devise an arrangement whereby they could have knowledge of who it was that had been nominated, and then send in their votes in time to be counted on election day. When we were considering the matter in the committee, a suggestion was made which, if I had been alone in the committee, would have been acted upon, that we should give the man a fourth alternative; that is to say, that we should put a fourth space giving the soldier the privilege of saying: I vote for So-and-so, leaving a blank space so that the soldier could fill in the name of the man for whom he wanted to vote. If that commends itself to this committee, I should be disposed to do that, because it would give the soldier an opportunity to vote for a particular man; and though, of course, the soldier would be voting without the certainty that the particular man would actually be nominated, at the same time, with regard to a considerable number of electoral districts, he would be fairly safe in his anticipation that that particular man was to be a candidate. I shall be glad to get as near as possible in every respect, so far as the soldiers overseas are concerned, to the conditions that would prevail if they were at home and able to exercise their vote; but the suggestion of voting for or against the Government or for an independent candidate was thought to be the nearest thing that could be done in cases where it was impossible for a man to know who the candidates were. I might say that this method was followed in the New Zealand Act.

Mr. OLIVER: When I was speaking some time ago I used the expression that I was willing to let the soldiers vote, but unwilling to let the Government count the vote. That expression has been taken up by other members, and the Minister of Justice has challenged the correctness of the phrase, and suggested that there is no provision in the Bill whereby the Government can count the vote. I wish to take issue with the minister on that point. I ask him who does count the vote if it is not the returning officer, who is an appointee of the Government? Therefore, the Government does, in fact, count the vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Government counts all the votes.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. But let me point out the difference between the conditions under which the Government, through the returning officer, counts the votes cast under this Bill, and the conditions under which the returning officer counts the votes under ordinary circumstances. In an ordinary election the ballots are marked and put in a ballot box under the active and direct supervision of scrutineers, sworn and bodily present, who watch the proceedings very carefully to see that what is intended by the voter shall be carried out by the deputy returning officer. When the poll is closed in the presence of those scrutineers, the ballot box is opened and the ballots counted in the presence of those same scrutineers; so that the country is not dependent upon the honesty of the deputy returning officer for an accurate count. He is subject to the check of the presence and activity of the scrutineers of the interested parties. But in the case of this Bill the ballots are sent to the returning officer at some time previous to the day of the count, and they are in charge of the returning officer for the intervening period. I need not enlarge upon the possibilities of what might be done by the returning officer during the period in which those ballots are exclusively in his charge without let or hindrance or observation from any other person whatsoever. My hon. friend will say that I am casting an aspersion upon returning officers. Well, Mr. Chairman, we have had experiences of returning officers, and of actions by our Government, that warrant us in being suspicious under those circumstances.

Mr. ROGERS: What experiences?

Mr. OLIVER: I will come to that presently. If it were proposed to insert in the Dominion Elections Act a provision parallel to this, whereby the ballots which have been cast on election day should be sealed up and remain in the charge of the returning officer without any observation by the scrutineers, would the minister approve of such an amendment? Would he not be ready to admit that we were placing responsibility upon or confidence in the returning officer that we should not place upon or in him? Now what is the difference between the re-

turning officer under ordinary circumstances and the returning officer under the circumstances contemplated by this Bill?

Mr. STEVENS: Under our present law is it not the practice for the returning officers to bring in the ballots from distant points—at all events, in Western Canada and Eastern Ontario?

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend surely knows how the balloting is conducted. The ballots are marked and handed to the deputy returning officer or the poll clerk, in the presence of the scrutineers of the different parties. They are placed in the ballot box in the presence of those scrutineers, and when the polls close the ballot box is emptied and the ballots counted in the presence of those scrutineers, and the count is forthwith issued. The process is entirely under the scrutiny of interested parties, and there are no chances as to what shall occur before the ballots are given, at any rate, their first count; whereas, in the case of this ballot, the box remains in the hands of the returning officer from the time he has received it until the poll is closed on polling day.

Mr. GERMAN: The ballots are not in a box?

Mr. OLIVER: No, they are not. That is not a proper protection for the people of Canada in the conduct of an election.

Mr. BLAIN: When are they counted?

Mr. OLIVER: When the poll is closed on polling day, the returning officer opens these ballots and counts them.

Mr. BLAIN: In the presence of whom?

Mr. OLIVER: In the presence, I presume, of the scrutineers.

Mr. BLAIN: The same as with other ballots?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know whether that is so or not, but that makes no difference to my point. My point is that these ballots have been in the possession, and under the sole responsibility, of the returning officer for an indefinite period, and none of the parties to the election besides himself has any means of preventing these ballots from being tampered with.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is that not so in the case of a recount under the present condition?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, but the ballots have already been counted in the presence of the scrutineers before the appeal is taken.

Mr. DAVIDSON: In the case of a recount, while the final count is pending, the ballots are still in the custody of the returning officer, and may be tampered with?

Mr. OLIVER: Undoubtedly, but the ballots have be n counted in the presence of the scrutineers, and a certificate has already been issued as to the result of the polling. There is no question as to the actual count, because in such a case there can be no dispute, but as to the ballots as to which there may be some measure of dispute, all these ballots are counted in the original count by the deputy returning officer before the scrutineers, and if they are not found in the ballot box when the recount takes place it is absolute evidence that the ballot box has been tampered with.

Mr. BLAIN: After the soldier votes the ballot must be returned to some individual. Whom would my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) suggest in place of the returning officer? Has my hon. friend any suggestion to make as to the form in which the ballot should be returned, if this proposal is not satisfactory?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not making any suggestions. I am replying to the assertion of the minister that the Government does not count the votes, I am pointing out that the Government does count the votes.

Mr. BLAIN: My hon. friend takes objection to the Bill as it has been introduced by the minister particularly because in this case the ballot is left in the possession of an individual. In what other way would my hon. friend suggest that it should be taken care of which would give greater security?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not making suggestions at this moment, but at the beginning of the consideration of the Bill I did make the suggestion that if it was desired that the soldiers should vote, and that they should vote under ordinary conditions, they could be given their qualification to vote wherever they were on election day.

Mr. BLAIN: What about the old country?

Mr. OLIVER: I was speaking, of course, only of those in Canada. That is the only way I can see to actually protect the public right as well as the right of the individual soldier. In that way it would be absolutely

protected. There are reasons against that being done which were stated by the minister, and I am not arguing on that point. But I have pointed out to the House a method whereby a soldier in Canada might exercise his franchise just as any other citizen would do, or as he would do if he were not a soldier, and the right of the public in regard to the casting of his ballot is protected.

Mr. DOHERTY: I would like to get clearly just what the method is. Does that mean that a soldier in Halifax should be allowed to go to Vancouver?

Mr. OLIVER: No.

Mr. DOHERTY: Then I understand it to mean that on the lines of the suggestion of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) we should provide at the military place where the man is, means by which he can vote in Canada.

Mr. OLIVER: In regard to the suggestion made by my hon. friend from South Renfrew, I might point out that there is just that undesirability I have already mentioned, that if a ballot is marked in Halifax to be counted in Vancouver, it must necessarily be sent to Vancouver and be held in the hands of the returning officer without check by any other party for such an indefinite period that there will not in my mind be proper or adequate protection for the sanctity of the ballot.

Mr. DOHERTY: Has the hon. gentleman any suggestion to make in addition to that?

Mr. OLIVER: I did make the suggestion at the beginning of the consideration of the first paragraph that if the soldier were allowed to cast his vote at the place, and in the electoral division, in which he was situated at the actual time of voting, exactly as any other citizen and under the same conditions and safeguards, his right and privilege would be protected and the public right to a proper exercise of the franchise would also be protected. I am not making that suggestion to the minister; I am stating a simple fact. The minister shows reasons why that would not be a good way to deal with the question and I appreciate his reasons. My hon. friend from South Renfrew made another suggestion which has in it certainly very many elements of advantage, a number of which advantages the Minister of Justice suggested. But there is still that difficulty that I mentioned and I do not think that it would be proper for me to agree to the provisions of the Bill unless I drew the attention of the minister to it. I do not wish to argue that point at the moment, but I was merely arguing the point that, as a matter of fact, the Government does count the votes. That is the point I want to put forward and that is why I say I object to the Bill. I do not object to the soldier voting, but I do object to the Government counting the votes when nobody else has a chance to check the Government or its officers in doing so.

In sections 2 and 3 it was provided that the ballots shall be sent to the commanding officer, and then that they shall be distributed by the commanding officer to some other officer, who shall, as a matter of practice, act as the deputy returning officer. He will hand out the ballot to the soldier and will receive back the ballot and the necessary affidavit. As the section reads, certainly the Government has the authority and the responsibility without let or hindrance of deciding who shall be the deputy returning officer who shall actually hand out these ballots, receive them and forward them in. I do not wish to make suggestions, but I think there was a suggestion made by the hon. member for Sunbury and Queens (Mr. H. H. McLean) that there should be some specific officer who, without the choice of the Government, would automatically be the man to handle that responsibility. That, I think, would be a very decided improvement, but I am taking the Bill as it is, not as it is going to be improved, and I say that when the Government takes the right to pick out whomever it pleases amongst its officers on the ground to act as deputies it is most essentially taking measures to see that only the right votes come in.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) does not wish to be unfair, and I would like to point this out to him. If he will look at the Bill he will find that, while the proposition may not be an effective proposition in his view, it does not take into the hands of the Government the selection of particular officers. We even exclude the High Commissioner from intervention, so that nobody who is of the Government should figure in this, and we made the secretary of the High Commissioner—an officer whom this Government did not appoint—the man who ex officio would take this thing on himself. We left it in his hands—although it may not be sufficiently definitely stated in the

Bill—to transmit these ballots to the proper officers for distribution, and then we provided that any commissioned officer might do this. I think as drafted the Bill is too indefinite on that point and that it requires to be made precise, but it certainly does not afford grounds for the very serious imputation the hon. gentleman has put upon those who drafted the Bill. I have asked my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) for suggestions as to other and better safeguards, and I am willing to put them in, but he persists in saying that this is a deep-laid scheme to find a way by which the Government will control the men, when all that I am looking for is a method by which this can be done by persons acting ex officio and not those whom the Government would pick out. And the hon. gentleman does all this to get to the very remote conclusion that the Government counts the ballots. He seems to think there is something criminal about that. I would like to point out to him that perhaps the Bill does not provide proper machinery to take care of the ballots on their way to be counted, but the Government certainly does not count them any more than it counts all the ballots in all the elections, which are counted by the returning officers; and these ballots are also to be counted by the returning officers. I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman does not want to be unfair, but I hardly think it is fair for him to continue putting the imputations on those who drafted this Bill, of having drafted it with a view of manipulating it in the most absolutely and utterly dishonest way conceivable, and with a view of placing themselves in a position where, if the suggestion of my hon. friend has any foundation, they are supposed to go out and see if they can find among our military officers men capable of every trick and device to destroy the genuineness of these ballots. I hardly think that is a fair line of argument.

Mr. OLIVER: There is no member of this House against whom I would be less inclined to make aspersions than the Minister of Justice. I am sorry that what I have said seems to have created on him the impression which he has stated to the House. But we are here on very responsible business; we have very serious duties to perform and while I want to eliminate any personal idea from what I have to say, I must take facts as I find them. I do not wish to show any personal animosity.

Mr. DOHERTY: There was most certainly no intention of any personal animosity on my part.

Mr. OLIVER: I know that, and I know that the minister has been very fair and very reasonable in everything he has said, but I must take this view: this is not the Bill of a committee; this is the Bill of the Government of which my hon. friend is the Minister of Justice, and of which Bill he is the responsible father. This Bill was introduced by resolution on the authority of His Royal Highness the Governor-General.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Six o'clock.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is not convenient to proceed with this Bill this evening, and I therefore move that the committee rise.

Mr. ROGERS: The reason being, that following the usual custom we will take private bills after eight o'clock and then Estimates, as we want to get through the balance of the Estimates.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

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

Post Office Department, 1913-14—contingencies—clerical and other assistance—further amount required, $2,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: That money has been expended, I suppose?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the Postmaster General please tell me who is the postmaster at Grande Prairie, what is his salary, from whom is the post office building rented, and what allowance does he receive on account of it?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I have not that information here. I will send it to the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Post Office, 1913-14—outside service—salaries—further amount required, $372,600.

Mr. CASGRAIN: This money is nearly all expended. The Estimates were made up in September, 1913, and in consequence no provision was made for the salaries of the current year for those taken on after that date. By reason of the expansion of the service, as I explained on my Main Esti-

mates, we were obliged to take on a number of employees, and this is the amount required to pay them.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the hon. minister please give particulars?

Mr. CASGRAIN: The new employees were distributed as follows: railway mail clerks, 100; mail transfer agents, 30; clerks and messengers in superintendents' offices, 17; clerks, messengers and porters in inspectors' offices, 39; clerks, letter carriers, messengers and porters in city post offices, 726.

Mr. MARCIL: Are these appointments all permanent?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the department still the system of taking on so-called labourers as temporary employees and afterwards drafting them into the permanent service?

Mr. CASGRAIN: No, we take on temporary clerks.

Mr. MARCIL: Can one of these be appointed to the permanent service without examination?

Mr. CASGRAIN: He is appointed for six months as a provisional clerk, after which he passes an examination.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister had time to look into the question I brought to his attention regarding a postal sub-office on Sherbrooke street in Montreal?

Mr. CASGRAIN: The inspector is now making an investigation of the matter, and we are awaiting his report.

Mr. MARCIL: I have received letters from a number of those interested, including Lt.-Colonel Baker, who took a great interest in the matter and worked unceasingly on it, calling on postmasters in Montreal and getting numerous petitions asking that some postal convenience of this kind be given to this district. At present, except for the ordinary letter-boxes on the street, there are no postal facilities. Sherbrooke is a main thoroughfare and a very busy one, yet it is without postal facilities. Also I have a letter from a leading citizen of Westmount with regard to the post office at the corner of Victoria avenue and Sherbrooke street. This gentleman, who is a former alderman and a leading citizen of Westmount, and greatly interested in the locality, makes the suggestion that when the department decides to provide better post office accommodation for his locality, it should place the post office on Sherbrooke street instead of on Victoria avenue, because Victoria avenue is not of such great relative importance as formerly.

Mr. CASGRAIN: We will certainly consider the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. VERVILLE: I would suggest to the Postmaster General that in future when he opens a small post office in Montreal, it should not be in a store that is closed three nights a week at six o'clock, and early in the other evenings. I do not want to complain of those already there, but the hon. gentleman knows that very often post offices are placed in drug stores which is a convenience to the public, as these stores are open in the evening. One change was made for which I was very sorry. The Government thought they were taking the post office away from a Liberal. As a matter of fact, the man was a Conservative. It is true, I recommended him, but I did so because his store was the best situated place in the parish for a post office.

I desire to put another question for information. Suppose that a person desires to send a registered letter to a member of the House, is it necessary for him to put on it a two-cent stamp and a five cent stamp for registration?

Mr. CASGRAIN: As to the latter question, it is not necessary to put a registration stamp on a letter addressed to a member during the session. As to post offices in stores that are closed in the evening, the hon. gentleman will realize that it is not always possible to find a store conveniently situated for a post office that is open after six o'clock. Where possible the department places post offices in drug stores, because they are kept open in the evening. That is the policy of the department. I think that what the hon. gentleman says is correct, and I will try to carry out his suggestion.

Mr. VERVILLE: They took a post office away from a drug store the proprietor of which happened to be a Conservative.

Mr. CASGRAIN: When?

Mr. VERVILLE: A couple of years ago; it was not under the administration of the present minister. A requisition bearing many names was sent to the department for the opening of a post office, in a drug store which was on the corner of a street. The post office was opened in a dry goods store, three hundred feet away from the corner.

The reason why I asked as to the sending of a registered letter to a member of the House is that at the very post office to which I referred they compelled a correspondent who was sending a letter to me to pay two cents for postage and five cents for registration. In answer to my correspondent's question, I said that this was absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. MARCIL: I desire to ask with regard to the sale of stamps on Sunday when, as the minister knows, in Montreal, cigar stores and fruit stores are open. I applied for a stamp at a fruit store and was told that they were not sold on Sunday. Has the department any rule to that effect?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I see no objection to the sale of these stamps by tobacconists and druggists.

Mr. MARCIL: What I want to know is whether it is against the law to sell these stamps on Sundays?

Mr. CASGRAIN: No, it is not.

Mr. MARCIL: Are the war stamps out yet?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes, we are issuing them now.

Mr. MARCIL: Are they to be used at once?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Not until the 15th.

Mr. KAY: At the present time rural mail carriers and stage drivers are paid only once every three months. As a rule their salaries are small, and in many cases they have to discount their cheques, as it were, in order to deal with the storekeeper and the moneylender, and when they receive their cheques they have to pay a considerable amount in the way of interest. I would suggest to the minister that he take into consideration the advisability of paying these men every month.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am informed by the officers of my department that reports are made by inspectors before the mail carriers are paid; and it would be impossible, with the service that we now have at our disposal, to have reports made and the men paid every month.

Mr. MARCIL: I would call the attention of the minister to the fact that no rural mail route has been established in my constituency. A few years ago a route was laid out by the late Postmaster General from New Richmond railway station around to New Richmond and Little Cascapedia. Tenders were called for, but no contract was awarded, because the amount proposed to be charged for the service was too high. This is rather disappointing, as New Richmond is one of the most promising localities in the constituency. Has the minister taken any steps in the matter, in the way of calling for tenders or introducing a service in that district?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am told that it was impossible to make a contract at a reasonable price for the carrying of the mail. There may be some very special circumstances why this has been the case, and if my hon. friend can give me any information on the subject I shall be glad to look into the matter.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand that the lowest tender was $1,000, and that the department considered that to be too high. Has the department taken no steps since then?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am informed that nothing further has been done. The $1,000 was considered by the department to be too high.

Mr. MACDONALD: I received a letter from my constituency with reference to a condition that has been created by the establishment of a rural mail delivery in that district. The minister will remember that I was in communication with him in regard to a rural mail delivery route which was asked for last year, and in respect to which, through some error, the answer was given that this route had not been applied for. In the adjoining district a rural mail route has been laid out from River John through the district of Hodson, returning to the village of River John. It was probably intended to afford facilities to a number of the people who have been getting their mail from Hodson post office through this rural mail delivery route, which is still hung up. With the establishment of the rural mail route from River John to Hodson, the Hodson post office has been closed, and the result is that ten or fifteen people who are not on the rural mail route and who would be on the proposed route if it were established, are not supplied with facilities for getting their mail and are obliged to go a long distance to the nearest office. I would suggest to the minister that the post office at Hodson be opened until the matter respecting the proposed rural mail delivery route to which I have referred is satisfactorily arranged.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I think that that is a reasonable request, and I will look into it immediately.

Mail service—ordinary land service, including rural mail delivery; further amount required, $365,000.

Mr. OLIVER: I would ask the minister to urge on his colleague the Minister of Public Works the desirability of spending the appropriation that has been in the Estimates for the last three or four years, a small matter of $5,000, for the erection of a building at Athabaska Landing which will accommodate the post office and telegraph and land offices, on the ground that the accommodation is urgently necessary for post office purposes.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sorry that the hon. member for Edmonton should be in doubt about this matter; I thought I made a definite promise the other night that I would go on with that work.

Mr. OLIVER: I hope I may take this as a definite promise.

Mr. ROGERS: It was definite before.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I will endeavour to see that my hon. friend keeps his promise.

Mail service by railways—further amount required, $300,000.

Mr. OLIVER: I presume that the Postmaster General is aware of representations that have been made in regard to the carrying of mails to Prince George. For some time after the opening of the railway the mail was carried from Vancouver to Prince George by all-rail route via Edmonton. I understand that recently that has been abandoned and the old route by stage from Ashcroft has been adopted. It has been represented to me by the Board of Trade of Edmonton that the change is not in the interest of Prince George or more particularly of Edmonton, that the service by way of Ashcroft is not nearly as efficient or as satisfactory and that the former conditons should be reverted to. It is further represented that whatever is done between Ashcroft and St. George the mail service by way of Edmonton should have the preference.

Patrol of the northern waters of Canada—further amount required, $50,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the minister explain that?

Mr. HAZEN: I explained the matter to the House when my Main Estimates were on. The trouble was that our appropriation last year was not large enough for the purpose, and we require $50,000 more in consequence of the loss of the Karluk. The loss of the Karluk with the supplies carried by her necessitated the purchase of the steamer North Star and a quantity of supplies to complete outfitting. The relief of the party from the Karluk also necessitated certain expenditure not anticipated when the Estimate was made up for the present year. To meet these disbursements it is necessary to obtain a supplementary vote of $50,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister give some more definite particulars than he gave on a former occasion in regard to the number, character, disposition and purpose of the vessels still in commission under that vote?

Mr. HAZEN: I thought I made a fairly definite statement, but I will give a further statement since August, 1913. In the month of August, 1913, the auxiliary schooner Karluk, carrying about half the members of the expedition and a large quantity of supplies, scientific outfits, etc., was caught in the ice some thirty miles off the Arctic coast of Alaska. The ice conditions that year were extremely bad in the Arctic, and no vessel was able to penetrate as far as Herschel island, the ships being held up to the westward of the boundary line between Alaska and Canada. After the Karluk had been held in the ice for some time it was presumed that she was stationary for the winter, and Mr. Stefansson, with three companions, Messrs. D. Jenness, A. McConnell and B. W. Wilkins, left the ship for exploring and hunting purposes and landed on the Alaskan shore. A heavy storm sprang up, the ice near the shore broke away and the Karluk drifted off and for the rest of the winter was carried by the ice in a westerly direction.

On January 11 the Karluk was crushed in the ice and sank. Every preparation had been made for such an event and the party landed safely on the ice with a full supply of provisions, munitions, fuel, etc., and a comfortable camp was established. At that time the sun was still below the horizon, which made travelling on the ice extremely difficult, and it was decided not to make for land until the return of the sun made travelling easier and safer. Land was visible from the shipwreck camp, which was presumed to be Wrangell island, but which turned out later to be Herald island.

Some members of the party chafed at the enforced inaction and were anxious to make an immediate move. Some of these men left the main party and in two detachments ventured out on the ice in an effort to reach land and safety. The members of these two detachments were never seen afterwards, although parties explored the ice and endeavoured to reach Herald island, and there is no doubt that, unfortunately, the eight men comprising these two detachments have perished.

The main party left camp on February 19 and reached Wrangell island on March 12. They brought up a large quantity of the supplies taken from the ship, built a house and camped there for the winter. Captain Bartlett, with one Eskimo and a dog team, left almost immediately for Siberia, which he reached after an arduous and venturesome journey across extremely rough ice with many open leads. After 17 days' travelling on the ice he landed about 50 miles west of North Cape on April 4. He then proceeded along the coast of Siberia and finally reached Emma harbour on May 16. Captain Bartlett's trip was a wonderful performance and is evidence of his courage and determination, and there is no doubt that the survivors of the Karluk owe their lives to his enterprise and endurance in his remarkable trip across the ice and along the coast of Siberia.

From Emma harbour Captain Bartlett was taken across Behring strait to St. Michael, Alaska, on the whaling steamer Herman, owned by Messrs. Liebes & Co. of San Francisco. This ship interrupted its trading and whaling venture to carry Captain Bartlett to a port from which he could communicate with the Canadian Government, and the thanks of the Government are due to the owners of the vessel for the kind act performed. Captain Bartlett immediately communicated with the Department of Naval Service at Ottawa and arrangements were promptly made for the relief of the marooned party. As a result of these arrangements during the summer of 1914 four ships endeavoured to reach Wrangell island to take off the wrecked men. These ships were the United States revenue cutter Bear, engaged in the patrol of northern waters, the Russian Government steamer Taymur and the ice-breaking steamer Corwin and the trading and hunting steamer King and Winge. After several attempts had been made by these vessels to reach Wrangell island, the King and Winge managed to reach the island in September and took off the survivors of the crew of the Karluk and a couple of days later transferred them to the United States revenue cutter Bear, which brought the party to Victoria.

To come back to Mr. Stefansson and his three companions, who landed from the Karluk in September, 1913, this party joined the other members of the expedition under Dr. Anderson who, with their ships, the Alaska and the Mary Sachs, were wintering at Collinson point, Alaska. A programme was then drawn up for the subsequent work of the party. It was arranged that in March, 1914, Mr. Stefansson would undertake an exploring trip on the ice in the Beaufort sea, with the intention of returning within about a month. Mr. Stefansson started on this trip rather late in the year and the ice was beginning to move. He intended proceeding north for a certain time and then returning to his starting point if possible. If, however, ice travel became difficult in that direction, he intended to travel to the east with the intention of reaching Bank's Land in the winter of 1914-15. He left instructions that in the summer of 1914 a vessel should be sent along the shores of Bank's Land to establish depots and erect beacons that would guide him on his return trip in the spring of 1915 if he was unable to reach the mainland before that date. These directions have been carried out. The vessel Mary Sachs, under Mr. Wilkins and Captain Bernard, left Herschel island in the early part of August and touched at Baillie island on August 19; then headed for Bank's Land to carry out Mr. Stefansson's instructions. The second party, under Dr. Anderson, left Herschel island on August 10 and Baillie island August 21, on the vessels Alaska and North Star, and established headquarters on Coronation gulf, where they expected to carry out scientific investigations during the fall of 1914, the following winter, and the summer of 1915. It is expected that the expedition will return in the late fall of 1915 or the following winter.

The loss of the Karluk with the supplies carried by that vessel, necessitated the purchase of another ship, the North Star, and a quantity of supplies, in order to complete the outfit of the party. The relief of the party from the Karluk also entailed certain expense, and to meet these various disbursements it will be necessary to obtain a supplementary vote of $50,000.

Mr. OLIVER: When was the last word received from the North Star and the Mary Sachs?

Mr. HAZEN: It was some time ago, I do not remember the date exactly.

Mr. OLIVER: Would it be after or before the close of winter?

Mr. HAZEN: Before.

Mr. OLIVER: And no word has been heard since winter set in?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think so. The department is expecting to hear word at any time. I will get the facts and give them to my hon. friend to-morrow.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the size and character of the North Star?

Mr. HAZEN: It was purchased at Demarcation point from Mr. Anderson at a cost of $13,000. I have not the tonnage here.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it the same kind of boat as the Karluk?

Mr. HAZEN: I think it is a little larger, but I am judging by the price only. The Karluk cost $10,000, and the North Star $13,000. Other circumstances, of course, may account for the difference in price. Still, the North Star is a substantial vessel.

Mr. OLIVER: From what the minister has read, there would seem to be no reason for alarm in regard to the safety of Stefansson and the two men with him.

Mr. HAZEN: Alarm is felt for the safety of Stefansson, but not for those members of the party who are on the Mary Sachs, the Alaska, or the North Star. The hon. gentleman is probably aware that Captain Bartlett was in Ottawa after his return from the North, and he thinks it possible that Stefansson is safe; in fact, he says he will not be at all surprised if Stefansson is found; but at the same time I think there is reason for apprehension.

Mr. OLIVER: According to the programme mentioned by the minister, Stefansson was not expected to return until 1915. Have the preparations been made that he requested?

Mr. HAZEN: Everything has been done.

Mr. OLIVER: This is a matter of more than ordinary interest. Would the minister be good enough to inform the House upon what information from Captain Bartlett he thinks that Stefansson is possibly lost?

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. HAZEN: Captain Bartlett's idea, if I remember correctly, was that Stefansson should have reached the mainland at an earlier date. I gathered from Captain Bartlett that it was on that account that he thought there was reason for apprehension for Stefansson's safety.

Mr. OLIVER: Have arrangements been made or are they being made to have one or more of the vessels up in the North make an attempt to trace Stefansson during the coming summer?

Mr. HAZEN: Instructions have been given to that effect. In addition to that, all vessels that were known to be going up North, whether belonging to the United States or any other country, were asked to be on the look-out for any trace of Stefansson.

Mr. OLIVER: Which particular vessel will have charge of this search on behalf of the Canadian Government, and who will be in charge of it?

Mr. HAZEN: The Alaska, the Mary Sachs, and the North Star are up there now. I forget the names of the officers who are in charge, but whoever they are they will do all they can.

Mr. OLIVER: All three vessels have received instructions to make that search?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: At what time were these instructions sent up North? It is a long road up there.

Mr. HAZEN: The instructions have been sent, but I could not say just when.

Mr. MARCIL: I was rather surprised to learn from an answer given by the minister a few days ago, in reply to a question of mine, that the minister did not see his way clear to compensating the fishermen of Gaspé and Bonaventure who suffered by the severe storm on the 4th of June last.

Mr. HAZEN: We have an item here.

Mr. MARCIL: But that is to compensate the relatives of those who were drowned. The minister, I understand, has decided not to allow anything to those fishermen who lost their boats and fishing gear. Many of these fishermen lost their boats and all their fishing gear right at the opening of the fishing season, and the loss handicapped them for the whole season. The minister knows that these fishermen

are not very wealthy, and I think it was rather unfortunate that he did not see his way clear to allowing them something. The storm was of unusual severity, the severest for many years, Dr. Wakeham says. The case of the fishermen is a most deserving one, and I think the minister should have allowed them something.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend is referring to the storm of unusual violence that swept over the northern part of New Brunswick and the Gaspé peninsula on the 4th of June, 1914. There was some discussion of this matter on the day the House prorogued last year, but the facts were not then known. While there was serious loss of gear on the Quebec side there was no loss of life; but in Gloucester county, N.B., twelve fishermen were drowned. In two instances, a father and his two sons, and in another, a father and a son perished. Of the twelve persons who were drowned, six left widows. It has been represented that the conditions were such as to call for assistance from the Federal Government, and it was urged that compensation should be made for loss of gear as well as assistance given to the widows and heirs of those who were drowned. My hon. friend knows that storms of considerable severity visit the different parts of the coast practically every year and cause serious destruction and loss of fishing equipment. While the storm my hon. friend has referred to was much severer than usual, if compensation were given for gear lost, similar consideration would have to be accorded to all fishermen who lose gear on account of stormy weather. It was considered that assistance could reasonably be given only to the heirs of the twelve persons who were drowned. The storm occurred at the beginning of the fishing season, so that those who might be depending on the persons who were drowned had received practically no earnings from them that year. The sum of $200 was paid to the widows, families or lawful heirs of each person drowned during that storm. The following is a list of the names and the amounts paid:

Name of Fisherman.	Paid to.	Relationship.
Prospère Albert	Mrs. Prospère Albert	Wife.
Martin P. Albert	" Martin P. Albert	"
Oliver Paulin	" Oliver Paulin	"
Joseph Thériault	" Joseph Thériault	"
M. LeBouthillier	" Augustine LeBouthillier	"
Joseph D. Boudreau	" J. D. Boudreau	"
Pierre LeBouthillier	" Augustine LeBouthillier	Mother.
Fred Chasson	" Fred Chasson	Wife.
J. B. Albert	" Prospère Albert	Mother.
J. Tériault	" Jos. Terriault	"
Fred Terriault	" Jos. Terriault	"
Théophile Dugas	Mr. Herbert Dugas	Father.

Cheques were made out to the names given in the list and forwarded to the fishery officer for distribution. The feeling was that if we gave compensation for loss of gear in this case we would be bound to make compensation for loss of gear in every storm that might take place. That principle has not been acted upon by this Parliament in the past, and I hesitated to establish a precedent.

Mr. MARCIL: I quite agree with the statement of the minister. Although I regret that he was unable to see his way to make compensation to these people for the loss of their gear. The amount allowed is very small, although it is considerable to some of these poor people. It must not be forgotten that the Government encourage the fisheries and pay bounties to the fishermen engaged in that calling. The trade of the fisherman has been growing smaller and smaller every year. The fisheries of Canada are supposed to be one of the important resources of the country, and I think the department would have been justified in giving favourable consideration to this claim. I do not assert that every fisherman losing his gear should make a claim upon the department, but in this case where the storm was very severe the refusal to grant assistance to those who have lost their property was rather hard treatment. When the fisherman gives up his calling and takes up another occupation it is hard to get him back. I know the minister realizes the importance of these fisheries and the desirability of their proper exploitation. I think that the minister, considering all the circumstances, might have given them something, but I suppose it is too late now to argue the point further.

Another thing I want to ask the minister about is the salmon pond at New Mills. This pond was on the Restigouche on the

broadlands above New Mills, but I am told that the experiment was not as successful as it should have been. Would the minister kindly state the reason of the removal to New Mills?

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend moved for the papers, and I am sorry they are not before the House. The change was made, I believe, on the recommendation of the fishery officers of the department. There had been trouble with the pond further up the Restigouche river where it was at Flatlands and it was felt that the work could be more successfully carried on where the pond now is at New Mills. The hon. gentleman is quite right; the first year's experiments at the pond were not an unqualified success. There was some trouble in consequence of the collection of sediment and dirt in the pond that interfered with the health of the salmon. That has all been overcome and my information is that the results are now most satisfactory. Last year they were fairly satisfactory, a considerable number of salmon fry being obtained in the pond and there is every reason to believe that it will be successful now. The papers will show all the correspondence and I hope they will be before the House to-morrow or at the latest on Monday.

Mr. MARCIL: Has any understanding been arrived at with the Government of Quebec in regard to the issue of fishery licenses?

Mr. HAZEN: Correspondence on this subject is now taking place between the Department of Justice and the Department of the Attorney General of the province of Quebec. I have not seen Mr. Newcombe for several days, but when I last spoke to him an arrangement had not been arrived at although I believe there was reason for hoping that an arrangement would be arrived at soon.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand that for the present year the existing condition shall continue and that no licenses will be issued by this department?

Mr. HAZEN: No such agreement has been arrived at that I am aware of.

Mr. MARCIL: That was the suggestion made.

Mr. HAZEN: We contend that the decision given in the British Columbia case is applicable to the province of Quebec, the decision being that there is a public right of fishery existing in tidal waters and, that being the case, that the administration of this fishery is in the hands of the Federal government. The government of Quebec contend that Magna Charta, under which this public right is given, does not apply to the province of Quebec, that Quebec does not come within the terms of Magna Charta. We are advised by the Department of Justice that that position is not well taken. However, the Government at Quebec does take the position very strongly that the judgment of the Privy Council does not apply to Quebec and we think it very desirable that there should be a judgment of the Privy Council finally disposing of the matter. We suggested to the authorities at Quebec that we should arrange to have a case stated to the Supreme Court of Canada and to the Privy Council that would absolutely decide whether the regulation of the fisheries shall come under the federal or provincial authorities. That was not accepted by the province of Quebec. There has been some correspondence under which the provincial authorities propose that they should go ahead this year and administer the fishery as they have been doing for a good many years in the past and that we should take steps, by arresting some one for violating the law of fishing without a license for the Dominion to bring the matter to the consideration of the courts again. The last correspondence I saw on the subject shows that the discussion has taken place along that line and I believe that an arrangement may be come to. It may be that my hon. friend has information a little later than I have that an arrangement has been come to.

Mr. MARCIL: I am sorry to say that I have not, but I hope that an understanding will be arrived at between the two Governments because it will be unfortunate if the population down there find themselves occupying a position between these two authorities and not knowing which has the jurisdiction. I would like to draw the minister's attention to a peculiar state of affairs in connection with the salmon fishery on the Baie de Chaleur and Gaspé coast. The minister knows the great importance of the salmon fishery in the Baie des Chaleurs in the months of May, June and July. The fish are brought up to Dalhousie and Campbellton and placed in cold storage to be kept until ready for shipment to market. Until last year we had a semi-weekly service which collected this fish along the Gaspé basin and took it to Dalhousie and Campbellton, there to be put in cold

storage. Last year the semi-weekly service between Montreal and Gaspé was discontinued and we were given a weekly service. This year the people of the coast generally, who found the service so useful to them in shipping to Quebec and Montreal, find that it is now of no use to them for the purpose of exporting their fish in May, June and the beginning of July. The result of the change in this service is that we have thousands and thousands of the most valuable Gaspé salmon, that are fished for all the way to a point below Grand river and along the coast of the county of Gaspé, lying there without means of shipment except by railway. The railway has no cold storage cars and can provide no proper facilities and the result is a great deal of trouble and an immense amount of loss. The last time that the Estimates of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) were up I asked him a question on that point and he told me that he was practically powerless. This company, the Baie de Chaleur Steamship Company, has a two-years' contract for a weekly service from Montreal to Campbellton, and it has turned out to be nothing but a freight service. The boat is very uncertain and the people do not know whether it will pass on Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday. The fishermen cannot afford to allow their fish to remain on the wharf waiting for the boat. Consequently, they have to resort to the railway and great loss has been occasioned. I thought that the minister might perhaps bring pressure to bear upon this company as the result of which they would give a semi-weekly service during May and June. This valuable salmon must be kept in cold storage and placed on the market at as early a period as possible and in the best possible condition if an adequate return is to be made to the fishermen.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be glad indeed to urge the matter on the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Naval Service—to provide a further amount for the removal of obstructions in the Fraser river, B.C., Governor General's warrant, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why was this work made necessary?

Mr. HAZEN: The obstruction was formed in the first place in 1913 by the building of the Canadian Northern railway road-bed along the bank of the river at Hell's gate and vicinity. It completely blocked the ascent of salmon to their spawning beds. In view of the great value of the salmon fisheries, immediately following the discovery of the blockade in the fall of 1913, work was started in making temporary channels to meet the changing heights of the water, and thus many salmon were enabled to pass up. The Canadian Northern railway was then called upon to restore the river to its original lines during the time of low water in February and March, 1914. This they finally started to do in a rather leisurely manner in February, 1914; but they had hardly got under way when a terrific slide came down from the side of the mountain at Hell's gate, and made conditions very much worse than ever. As it became obvious that only by the exercise of the greatest possible energy could the obstructions be sufficiently removed to enable the ascent of the salmon during the coming season, a conference of engineers on the spot was arranged for. The engineers were the department local engineer in charge of the removal of obstructions in rivers, the engineer of the New Westminster Harbour Commission, and the engineer of the Provincial Department of Public Works. They estimated the cost to be at least $60,000, and recommended that the work be placed in the hands of the Pacific Dredging Company, which was best equipped to carry it out. This was done, the company to receive ten per cent of the cost as profits, plus rental for the machinery. The work has proved of much greater magnitude than was anticipated, and has been going on ever since. It is expected that it will be finished in April. By the installation of a temporary sluice and temporary channels, the fish were passed up this year. Representatives of the Canadian Northern have been in Ottawa and they have taken the matter up with my department. I understand they admit their liability in connection with the first obstruction, but they claim that the second slide was not due to any work of construction on their part. That, of course, will have to be fought out with them.

9 p.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the work been finished?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Including this sum of $50,000 and $30,000 in the Main Estimates for next year, there would be a total voted of $140,000 altogether.

Mr. HAZEN: We are assuming that it will cost $30,000 for the work done since February. There was a miscalculation as to the cost of this work. We were first

told that it would come to $60,000, and I had $60,000 placed in the Estimates, but to our surprise we found that was not enough. We think this vote will cover the full amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the minister know who the Pacific Dredging Company are?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does he know that they are in any way a part of Mackenzie & Mann?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think they are.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It has been intimated to me that this company is controlled by Mackenzie & Mann.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think so, but we had the report of a board of the very best engineers we could get, namely, our own engineer, the engineer of the New Westminster Harbour Commission, and the engineer of the provincial Department of Public Works in British Columbia, and it was on their report we placed the work in the hands of this dredging company.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What proportion of the cost is the Canadian Northern Company willing to pay; I understand they are willing to pay for the obstructions caused by their own works?

Mr. HAZEN: The engineer of the Canadian Northern Company has had communication with the deputy minister, Mr. Desbarats, and I understood they had a preliminary talk over the matter, and the Canadian Northern agreed that for the first obstruction they were liable, but they disputed their liability for the second. The opinion of our engineer is that the last slide was caused by the building of the railway along the river bank at the foot of the hill and disturbing it.

Lighthouse and Coast Service—agencies, further amount required, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the minister any information with regard to the purchase of coal in Vancouver; I am informed that it is purchased without tender?

Mr. HAZEN: Does my hon. friend refer to the coal purchased for the Marine and Fisheries Department or for the Department of Naval Service?

Mr. PUGSLEY: My informant says that the Marine and Fisheries Department and the Quarantine station—that of course would be in the Department of Agriculture—do not call for tenders for coal, and I should very much like to be advised as to the prices paid. Perhaps the minister will tomorrow give information as to that?

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be glad to; but my impression is that they do call for tenders. We certainly do on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I submit this statement to the minister and he promises to give me the information.

Lighthouse and Coast Service—administration of pilotage and maintenance and repairs to steamer Eureka—further amount required. $7,000.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): About three weeks ago, when the first Estimates of the hon. minister were laid before the House, I called his attention to the fact that two ships had met with ill-luck off a place called Sainte-Félicité. The hon. gentleman promised at the time that he would furnish detailed information as regards that casualty. I would like to know whether he is now in a position to supply that information, and also whether he has made enquiries as regards the placing of a buoy at that place and has made up his mind to place one there, or take some means of avoiding such casualties henceforth.

I understand that last summer two ships met with accidents. I would like to know whether the department was notified of such occurrences. A large number of ships pass there and if no aids to navigation are provided, ships may meet with disaster and become total wrecks.

I may further point out to the hon. gentleman that, to my mind, the danger signal which has been placed about one mile west of the church of Ste. Félicité, does not fully answer the requirements of navigation. If a lighthouse or danger signal were placed at Cap à la Baleine, a short distance from there, I think it would be the means of avoiding accidents such as those which occurred last summer. I would like to know whether the department has been notified of such occurrences.

Mr. HAZEN: I understand my hon. friend to refer to what he claims to be the insufficiency of certain aids to navigation on the St. Lawrence, and speaks of a buoy being needed at Ste. Félicité and some further signal stations being required there. I do not know whether he has called this to my attention before, so that I have referred it to the Lighthouse Board, or not. But, if not, I should be glad to call the attention of the Lighthouse Board to the matter and ask for their decision.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the minister contemplate any work in the way of lighthouse service on the Baie des Chaleurs?

Mr. HAZEN: I gave information on those points when my Main Estimates were under discussion. I have not the facts before me now, but I can get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. BOULAY: Last year an investigation was held at Father Point into the case of Captain Belanger. I noticed there was a gentleman there attending the investigation who seemed to be very much interested in it. But still he had no business to be there. I inquired who he was and found that his name was Capt. Lindsay. He was there three or four days doing nothing at all, understanding nothing of what was going on. I should like to know from the minister if Captain Lindsay was there by his orders or was he there at his own wish?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not recollect whether I personally gave orders to Captain Lindsay to attend or not. He may have attended by the order of his superiors in the department. He is the Superintendent of Pilots on the St. Lawrence, and he may have considered that when an investigation of this sort was taking place—and I would not say he was wrong—it was his duty to be present to learn what went on and what action should be taken.

Construction of a vessel to replace the Scout —further amount required, $43,000.

Mr. HAZEN: That is on the St. Lawrence, running from Kingston to Prescott.

I promised an hon. gentleman that when my Estimates were before the committee I would lay on the table a statement of what had been done respecting steam trawlers. Though the present vote does not relate to this subject, perhaps I may be allowed this opportunity to put this statement with regard to steam trawlers on record.

Statement re Steam Trawling.

As steam trawlers from France and the United States, as well as those that operate from Nova Scotia ports, fish on this side of the Atlantic, and as even the inshore boat fishermen usually fish more than three miles from shore, it is obvious that the only permanently effective way of controlling this fishery is by an international arrangement.

In 1910 it was recommended to His Majesty's Government that a conference of representatives of the countries interested, should be called, with a view to reaching an arrangement for the entire prohibition of steam trawling on this side of the Atlantic.

In 1911 a reply was given in effect, that His Majesty's Government would find it difficult to support such a conference, but suggested that one might be called to consider the regulation of the fishery along the lines of the North Sea Convention.

While there were many reports of destruction of the gear of ordinary fishermen, interference with their operations and injury of fishing grounds, etc., there was little or no positive information in the premises before the Government. Moreover, while the majority of those engaged in the industry were opposed to trawling, there were those who strongly favoured this method of fishing as an improved one that should be encouraged, and the only one by which a constant supply of fish to meet the demands of an increasing fresh fish business in Canada could be supplied. Hence it was considered best to have the affects of such steam trawling as was being carried on investigated before going into conference. In the spring of 1912 it was arranged with the United States and Newfoundland authorities that during that season such investigations would be carried on independently, the understanding being that, immediately following the completion of such, His Majesty's Government would be asked to call a conference.

The investigations in Canada and the United States were carried out under precisely similar instructions to the investigators; but the United States took much longer to complete its investigations than was at first anticipated. The report of its investigators was submitted only a short time ago.

It is now feasible to ask His Majesty's Government to invite a conference, which it is proposed to do forthwith.

As, however, the conclusions of such conference could not be reached in time to be made effective this year, and as it seems possible that a considerably larger number of trawlers than heretofore will come to this side this year, it is eminently important that some means be taken to protect the ordinary fishermen.

In recent years there does not appear to have been destruction of the gear of the ordinary fishermen on the banks by trawlers. Therefore, if the inshore fishermen are amply protected, there would not likely be difficulty during the present year.

After careful consideration of the matter, it has been decided to do this by a regulation under the Customs Act, whereby the master of any steam trawler will be required, before he is granted a clearance for the fishing grounds, to give the customs officer a declaration that he will not fish within at least 12 miles from shore. This will apply to French trawlers operating from Canadian ports, and those that do not, do not fish in the immediate vicinity of our coasts. Failure to comply with this requirement or a breach of the understanding will render the master and the vessel liable to the penalties prescribed for a violation of customs regulations.

As boat fishermen do not operate more than nine or ten miles from shore, this regulation will assure them full protection.

The regulation will apply to all trawlers clearing from a Canadian port on the Atlantic coast. While the United States trawlers do not clear from such ports, their operations so far have not extended beyond the Georges Banks, and there is nothing to indicate that they will during the present year.

That matter was duly considered by the Commissioner of Customs, the deputy minister and myself, and accordingly an Order in Council was passed along the lines mentioned in the statement which I have just read.

Mr. MARCIL: Are these trawlers allowed to operate in Baie de Chaleur?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think any have ever gone into the Baie de Chaleur.

Mr. MARCIL: There was one there three or four years ago.

Mr. HAZEN: They cannot go in under this regulation.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the minister consider that he has legal authority under the Customs Act to make and enforce this regulation?

Mr. HAZEN: It is the view of the Commissioner of Customs and the department that they have full authority to enforce it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This regulation will be useful to some extent as applied to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, where trawlers are operating along the coast. It will be of no service, of course, to those who fish on the banks of Newfoundland. Does the minister feel certain that he has not power to enforce the regulation adopted two years ago?

Mr. HAZEN: While I have not an opinion in writing from the Justice Department, the opinion of the Justice Department, having heard the representations made by the Government of France through their consul general in Montreal, is that it would not be desirable, from the legal standpoint, to attempt to enforce it. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice himself gave careful attention to the matter, and conferred with his deputy minister and with me about it, and the conclusion arrived at was that it would not be safe to attempt to enforce that provision. There is a treaty with Japan under which their vessels have certain rights in Canadian ports, and the French Government, being a favoured nation, has the same rights as are given by treaty to Japan.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do I understand the minister to say that this regulation will not be enforced against French fishermen?

Mr. HAZEN: That is right, if my hon. friend refers to the Act passed two years ago.

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is no reason why Canadian or British trawlers should not be prevented from operating.

Mr. HAZEN: Not at all. Canadian trawlers are not allowed within the three mile limit.

Mr. SINCLAIR: They are allowed to clear from Canadian ports and to operate on the banks.

Mr. HAZEN: Under this regulation they will have to undertake not to fish within twelve miles from the shore.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister says that we are not in a position to prevent French trawlers from operating on the banks, owing to the Japanese treaty. My point is this: is my hon. friend not in a position to prevent trawlers registered in Great Britain and in Canada from operating on the Banks, irrespective of any treaty that may exist?

Mr. HAZEN: I think we could, but we would not accomplish much by doing that. If you do not stop the French trawler, there is not much use in stopping the British trawler.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It depends upon the number that operate. If a large number of British trawlers should come across and operate on the Banks, it would be very important to have the power to apply the restriction to them.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I understand the minister to say that his department enforced the regulation with respect to the operations of these trawlers within the three-mile limit, and that he had no complaints of any kind within the last year. I may tell the minister that he is not properly informed on that point. It is a fact that steam trawlers operated in the Gulf of St. Lawrence along the coast of the county of Inverness last season and the season before. They have adopted a method by which they can evade the regulations and carry on operations without difficulty. They leave port after dark, and begin their fishing along the coast within the three-mile limit before daylight. The minister says that he is going to enforce the regulation to prevent steam trawlers clearing from ports in Canada from operating within twelve miles of the shore. I wish to point out that the vessels of the protection fleet must exercise greater vigilance than they have exercised in the past if they wish to accomplish anything, not only in enforcing this regulation,

but in enforcing the regulations which at present exist. The fact of the matter is that the existing regulations prohibiting the operation of steam trawlers within the three-mile limit have not been enforced. and the result is that half the fishermen along the coast of Inverness county have abandoned fishing altogether. My hon. friend knows that the equipment which these fishermen require is quite expensive, and they have had such sad experiences in the past in the destruction of gear, nets and trawls that they will not now take any further risks. These trawlers leave Port Hawkesbury or some other point in the Strait of Canso after dark; they drop their gear, pursue their course to the Gulf of St. Lawrence and are outside the three-mile limit before daylight. The information which the minister has with respect to the enforcement of these regulations is not correct. The vessels that he sends down there to enforce the regulations, if they wish to accomplish anything, must pursue a vigilant policy, and not remain tied up in port. The only suggestion made by the fishermen along the coast is that the protection fleet should be on duty at night; this is the only way of discouraging the practice which the steam trawlers have of operating within the three-mile limit. Seven years ago, when first I came to this House, I took occasion to criticise the late Government for their laxity in the matter of enforcing these regulations. I have repeated the same charge since then, and I repeat it again now. The protection vessels cannot accomplish their purpose if they are not right on the spot before daylight.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. member has made the statement very positively, and I do not wish to question what he says, but if he is right the officials of my department who make reports to me are wrong. So far as I know, the gentlemen who are in the department, and who are the same gentlemen who have been there for a number of years, are thoroughly competent, and are trying properly to discharge their duties. The statement they make is that practically no fishing was done last year by trawlers within the three-mile limit, and in support of that they refer to the fact that during the last year practically no complaints on that score have reached the department. I do not question the hon. gentleman's statement; he has made it more positively than I ever heard it made before. I will at once call the attention of my officials to his statement, and see what they have to say in regard to it. But their reports have been such as to convey an entirely different impression from that which the hon. member's positive statement to-night would convey to the House.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: My information comes from the fishermen, and they will be very much surprised to find from to-morrow's Hansard that the minister is so ill-informed, I care not what official gave the information. I took occasion in this House to find fault with the late Government for their failure to enforce the regulations, and I say most emphatically that in this case I have the information from the fishermen. I am not surprised to hear the minister say that he has had no complaints this last year or the year before. The reason for that is that the fishermen are discouraged because their complaints were not heeded in the past in this regard and are abandoning the fishing. They cannot afford to buy gear and have it destroyed before daylight by steam trawlers. The fishermen are at my back in this matter.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This is a question of very great importance all around the coasts of the Maritime Provinces, and if the minister would be kind enough to put the text of the regulations on Hansard it would be very interesting. We would like to see his new regulation.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be very glad to bring it down to-morrow.

To defray expenses in connection with the preparation, etc., of a Dominion Electoral Atlas based on the Redistribution Act of 1914, $8,500.

Mr. MARCIL: What does the hon. gentleman intend doing in regard to the Dominion electoral atlas for the new constituencies? Will it be distributed to members of the existing Parliament as well as to members of the next Parliament?

Mr. CODERRE: Five thousand copies are to be printed. Members of this Parliament will have one copy each, and so will members of the next Parliament.

Mr. MURPHY: Have arrangements yet been made for the work.

Mr. CODERRE: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: With whom?

Mr. CODERRE: The Dominion Geographer and the King's Printer.

Mr. MURPHY: Who is to do the publication?

Mr. CODERRE: The King's Printer. The intention is to have it printed in the bureau.

Mr. MURPHY: Has any arrangement been made to that end?

Mr. CODERRE: I am informed by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that this is being done now.

Mr. MURPHY: All the work is being done in the Printing Bureau?

Mr. CODERRE: The arrangement is being made with the Printing Bureau.

Mr. MURPHY: Does that mean the work?

Mr. CODERRE: The work is not started yet.

Mr. MURPHY: Then it does not mean anything?

Mr. CODERRE: The lithographing is to be done outside and the other part in the Printing Bureau.

Mr. MURPHY: Has any arrangement to that end been entered into?

Mr. CODERRE: There is no arrangement yet, so far as I know.

Mr. MURPHY: Have tenders been asked?

Mr. CODERRE: No.

Mr. MURPHY: Will tenders be asked?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: From whom?

Mr. CODERRE: I do not know.

Mr. MURPHY: From whom can we get that information?

Mr. CODERRE: I do not know yet who will be called upon to tender.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why not open it to the public and permit any one to tender?

Mr. CODERRE: Really this matter does not come under my department. This will be done, I am told, by the Dominion geographer.

Mr. MURPHY: He will only prepare the copy; he will not do the work. That will be done in some printing or lithographing establishment.

Mr. CODERRE: The printing and lithographing are done as I have said.

Mr. PROULX: How was the last one made?

[Mr. Murphy.]

Mr. CODERRE: By the Printing Bureau.

Mr. PROULX: The plates have been preserved?

Mr. CODERRE: I am told that they are of no use. In the province of Quebec there will be many changes in the new atlas.

Mr. PROULX: In many counties there are no changes and the old plates would do for them.

Mr. CODERRE: There will be many changes because we will give all the municipalities in the atlas this year.

Mr. MARCIL: Will it be the same size as the last one?

Mr. CODERRE: A little larger. It will have a history of each district on the back of the map.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand that one copy was given to each member of the House last time and if he required additional copies he had to pay $2 apiece. What is the policy of the department in that respect?

Mr. CODERRE: They have to pay $2 for each copy above the one given to them.

Mr. MARCIL: Outside of members of the Senate and House of Commons, who are to get copies? The newspaper press?

Mr. CODERRE: Parliamentary distribution as usual.

Mr. MARCIL: What does that mean?

Mr. CODERRE: Distribution to newspaper men.

Mr. MARCIL: The same distribution as the last time?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: When will the work be ready in book form?

Mr. CODERRE: About the 1st of June.

Mr. MARCIL: And will the distribution take place then to members of this Parliament?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister has not yet answered my question. I would like to hear him say that this work would be put up to public tender and printers would all have a chance to bid on it. It appears that under this Administration the old system of tender and contract has practically been abandoned. They appear to have a

list of favourites in each of the departments to whom letters or telephone messages are sent whenever work is to be done; and the general public have no chance. I do not think that should be the rule in Canada; it should be the exception; I know that in some cases it may be the best thing to do. Last year I picked out at random four cases from each of three departments, and I asked a question in the House as to what papers the tenders had been advertised in. The answer was that the tenders were not advertised in any papers at all, that there was no publication whatever. That appears to be the rule under the present Administration. I should like to ask the minister to see that for once some work is thrown open to the public, and given to the lowest or the best tenderer. Let us make an exception in this case, and have the work done without graft.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: That sounds good, but it would be something brand-new. It was never done in the past in this country.

Mr. OLIVER: If it is good, why does my hon. friend object simply because it is new?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I did not object.

Mr. CODERRE: Of course, this does not come strictly under my control. I am told that tenders were never called for in cases of special work of this kind.

Mr. MURPHY: I have only to say that if my hon. friend acts on that advice, he will get into more trouble than he ever dreams of. Tenders were called for.

Mr. MARCIL: How many copies are to be bound, and how many to remain unbound?

Mr. CODERRE: There will be 1,000 bound in cloth, 1,000 in paper, and 2,000 unbound.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I may be allowed at this point to offer a suggestion. For some years past I have taken an interest in elections, and it strikes me that since the Dominion Government has taken over the making of the voters' lists, many errors have crept in the lists for the county of Rimouski. As a result of such oversights, it often happens that voters are deprived of their franchise, and inconvenienced in other ways. It seems to me that such hardships might be obviated by having the lists made by people who are familiar with the names of French voters in the province of Quebec. I realize that people who are familiar with the English language only, are liable to make such mistakes, especially as regards surnames, and mistakes as regards surnames are, of course, the most objectionable. All such oversights would be avoided if people thoroughly familiar with the spelling of French names were appointed to make the lists. As I have just stated, errors concerning surnames are the most misleading, and they might be avoided by following the course I have suggested.

Supplementary Estimates for 1915-16—to provide for payment of the full sessional indemnity of members of the House of Commons —days lost through absence caused by illness or public business during the present session— notwithstanding anything to the contrary in chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, an Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, or any amendments thereto—payment to be made as the Treasury Board may direct, $19,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Can we have a list of the names? I simply inquire to make sure that the name of Dr. Béland is not forgotten.

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the list here, but I can assure my hon. friend that Dr. Béland is not forgotten.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the late Mr. Richards on the list?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the list here.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the definition of public business? I understand that this is to provide for the payment of indemnity to members who are absent on account of illness or on public business. I can understand that members engaged in military affairs are certainly entitled to this consideration. Is there any other class of business that is considered public business which would entitle members engaged in it to the payment of their indemnities?

Mr. ROGERS: I understand that great care is exercised by the committee that has this in charge. Any man, like Sir Edmund Osler, who is engaged with his own business is docked for every day he is absent. I do not think there is any definition of public business. I suppose it would mean business such as that in which Colonel Currie, Dr. Béland and others are engaged.

Mr. MARCIL: How many members are at the front?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the list before me, but I think we all know which of our colleagues are in the fight.

Mr. MARCIL: I think the names should be given, as it is a credit to the House. I can recall five members: the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod); the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie); the hon member for Brome (Mr. Baker); the hon. member for Beauce (Hon. Dr. Béland), and the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Carrick).

Mr. STANFIELD: I might say that in this matter the Whips are consulted by the Accountant of the House. We both prepare a list and see that no person is put on except those who are absent through sickness. The accountant tells me that Dr. Béland is not entitled to be paid out of the military vote for those who have gone to the front. Therefore his name is included in this vote. The same thing applies to Sir George Perley and Colonel Baker, the hon. member for Brome.

Mr. MARCIL: Was not Dr. Béland appointed to the Canadian medical corps by the Minister of Militia and Defence?

Mr. STANFIELD: I understand that he is a prisoner.

Mr. MARCIL: At present, but he was appointed to the Canadian medical corps.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if any other kind of business than military business is recognized within the meaning of this vote, and, if so, what?

Mr. STANFIELD: Nothing but Government business is recognized. Sir George Perley is away on Government business, and the Hon. Mr. Burrell's name was also included, because he was away for nearly a month at the San Francisco exposition.

Miscellaneous—to provide for the purchase of 400 copies of the Life of Sir George E. Cartier, by John Boyd, $2,000.

Mr. PROULX: Who, besides the members, will get a copy of this work?

Mr. CODERRE: I have arranged to give a copy to the members of the press gallery, and there are a few copies left.

Distribution of Parliamentary documents—further amount required, $1,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Two electors of mine applied for copies of the Auditor General's Report. One was an English-speaking elector and the other a French-speaking elector. I sent to the English-speaking elector the report for 1914, and when I applied for the French version of the report I was told that the report for 1914 had not been printed in French, and that only one volume of the 1913 report had been printed in French. If we are going to have these blue-books we ought to have them in reasonable time; otherwise it is wasting money to no purpose. I want to know if any action has been taken to bring the publication of these reports up-to-date.

Mr. CODERRE: The last two volumes of the French version of the Auditor General's Report for 1912-13, and the French version of the Auditor General's Report for 1913-14, are just being printed, and I expect them to be ready for distribution within three months.

Mr. MARCIL: Why was not the report for 1912-13 printed before this?

Mr. CODERRE: Because it is impossible to print the two versions together.

Mr. MARCIL: You are not doing that in the case of the English version for 1913-14. If these blue-books are to be of any use they must come out in a reasonable time; otherwise it is a sheer waste of public money to issue them.

Mr. CODERRE: The King's Printer tells me that when he came in the French version of the report for 1912-13 had not been commenced. He is attending to that matter, with the result that I have stated.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand the minister has organized a staff especially for the translation of the Auditor General's Report?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes, the money was voted last year.

Mr. MARCIL: How many translators are there?

Mr. CODERRE: Three.

Mr. MARCIL: Are they stationed in Ottawa?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the printing being done at the Printing Bureau in this case?

Mr. CODERRE: Not of the 1913-14 report.

Mr. MARCIL: Where?

Mr. CODERRE: Montreal.

Mr. MARCIL: By contract?

Mr. CODERRE: No contract, but at Bureau rates, as usual.

Mr. MARCIL: Who is printing it in Montreal?

Mr. CODERRE: La Patrie.

Mr. PROULX: Why is it necessary to send so much printing and lithographic work outside? When you look at the Auditor General's Report it is astonishing to see the amount of money that is spent by the Government for outside printing. There is a lavish distribution amongst outside printers. La Patrie must have got thousands of dollars and different newspapers in different provinces are treated with almost equal liberality. Cannot the Printing Bureau do the work for the Government?

Mr. CODERRE: No.

Mr. PROULX: I am inclined to think that a lot of this money is wasted. For some little public work the Government will advertise in fifteen or twenty-five newspapers. It is a waste of money. They spend more money sometimes in advertising than the whole work is to cost.

Mr. CODERRE: Advertising is done outside of the Printing Bureau.

Mr. PROULX: I do not refer only to advertising; I refer also to printing and lithography.

Mr. CODERRE: Last year we had an increase of $300,000 in the amount of printing, $200,000 of which was done in the Bureau and $100,000 outside. Although we have the same accommodation the work is increasing every day. That is the reason why so much work is sent outside. There is a part of this work which never has been done in the Printing Bureau and which cannot be done at present because we have not the necessary plant. We have not the plant to do the lithographic work, and it is absolutely necessary to go outside. That represents the largest amount of work done outside.

Mr. PROULX: Are tenders called for this work which is given to different printing companies?

Mr. CODERRE: In some cases tenders are asked for, but generally not. We pay according to the rates which have been established for years and which are known as Bureau rates.

Mr. PROULX: Do you discriminate amongst the newspapers?

Mr. CODERRE: I give to those who ask.

Mr. PROULX: The Liberal papers do not ask?

Mr. CODERRE: They do not.

Mr. PROULX: They are very reasonable.

Mr. MARCIL: Has any action been taken on the report of the commission appointed last year to deal with the printing and distribution of public documents, and which suggested that there was great waste in printing useless blue-books which were for the most part thrown away. That commission consisted of Sir Joseph Pope, Dr. Doughty and another gentleman?

Mr. CODERRE: That commission was in connection with the Archives, and the commissioners visited all the departments and ascertained that there were a number of documents worth preserving, as a result of which there is a vote in the Main Estimates this year for $100,000 to enlarge the Archives building, so as to accommodate these documents.

Mr. STANFIELD: My hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) is thinking of the joint report of the Printing Committee on that matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member (Mr. Marcil) is quite correct in what he says. That commission incidentally reported in reference to the number of blue-books which were printed and never used, and they made a recommendation in that respect. Recently I submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing of both Houses a proposal to reduce the number of some of these publications, and the committee dealt with the matter so far as they could in a report to the House, which was adopted yesterday. I have considered the matter carefully for some time, and it is my view that a committee should be appointed to take up the whole question of printing and distributing reports and parliamentary documents, so that it may be done on a more businesslike basis than is pursued at present. In my judgment, hundreds of thousands of dollars could be saved every year if the printing and distribution of these publications were curtailed. One of the recommendations of the commission to which my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) has referred was a very good one: it was to the effect that the present system of distributing the blue-books should be done away with. These publications are now carted from the Printing Bureau to the distribution office of the House of Commons, and men are employed

to carry them around to the rooms of the members, who often refuse to take them, and they have to be piled up in the corridors. It was recommended that a post office or postal station should be established in or close to the Printing Bureau, from which officers of the Post Office Department could send the publications by mail, as a supply for the House of Commons and Senate, and thus save a lot of unnecessary labour and expense. Copies of these publications could be kept in a small library or distribution office in the House of Commons for the use of members of the Senate and House of Commons during the session, and a couple of employees could be placed in charge of them. There are now sent to each member two copies of each report published, which are duplicated in the Sessional Papers, 24 copies of the Trade and Commerce Monthly Report, two copies of the same, in the Customs reports, and two copies of all other reports. It seems to me that there is a great waste of money in this, and that a good business committee composed of one or two of the deputy heads of departments, together with the King's Printer, the Superintendent of Printing, and a Minister of the Crown, would be able to recommend a commonsense basis on which this distribution should be made. The present system is unbusinesslike and extravagant, and serves no good purpose. I have been told that some of these publications are not taken out of the post office by parties to whom they are granted, and have to be burned, which of course costs money.

Mr. MARCIL: The House is grateful to Mr. Speaker for the attention he has given to this matter, and while the same complaint existed in my time as Speaker I think it has grown even worse since. The French-speaking members of the House have even greater reason to realize the waste, because when the blue-books are printed in English two copies of each are sent to them, and then a year or two afterwards when the translation is made they get another dose of the editions in French. Some of these are technical books and of no earthly use for any general purpose. The recommendation of the commission to which I referred, and the further recommendation of His Honour the Speaker tonight, are worthy of the attention of the Government. I wish to know if the minister has taken any action or intends to take any action in the matter.

[The Speaker.]

Mr. SPEAKER: I recently submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing that we could very well cut off half this waste by distributing in future one copy of these documents to each member instead of two copies as at present. If a member required further copies he could send a post-card to the Printing Bureau and get them in reasonable number. The Joint Committee on Printing recommended my suggestion to the House, and the House concurred in that report yesterday. Several members of the House have informed me that they do not want these reports at all, and in that way the waste can be still further lessened. In my judgment, that rule should apply to the distribution of the bound copies of Hansard as well, because I think that one bound copy of Hansard for each member instead of two would be quite sufficient.

Mr. CODERRE: I have before me the report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, in which the King's Printer makes a suggestion to the same effect as that made by Mr. Speaker.

Miscellaneous printing—further amount required, $50,000.

Mr. CODERRE: This amount is required to pay for printing done during the year, mainly of departmental reports. It is not possible, under our present system, to estimate in advance what will be the amount spent on this service. Let me give an illustration. By an Order in Council the Department of Agriculture is authorized to print as many copies of its report as it desires. Last year they caused to be printed 80,000 copies of a report of about 900 pages. This year, we have had to print 100,000 copies of a report of 1,500 pages, the report of the Central Experimental Farm. So, it is impossible for my department to foresee what will be the amount required during the year. I make this explanation to show how it comes that we are asking for this supplementary vote of $50,000.

Mr. MARCIL: There should be some control over the number of books printed, and only as many should be printed as are needed in the public interest, so that there may not be a printing of thousands on thousands of books that are unnecessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me that the charges for printing should be grouped under one head. At present, without very great labour, one cannot ascertain what is

the cost of printing to this country. Every department pays for its own printing?

Mr. CODERRE: Not for the annual report.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But for a great deal of printing they do pay?

Mr. CODERRE: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Besides all these other items, we have this amount of $50,000, a further amount required for the printing of the year. The items for printing should be so arranged that on consulting the Auditor General's Report we could see what printing costs the country. If anything is paid for printing documents for the House of Commons or the Senate, let that appear among the items in its proper place.

Mr. McKENZIE: I desire to make a suggestion to the minister about printing. When printing of a special nature has to be done it is hardly worth while to call for tenders, because you have to deal with those who supply these specialties. But it would be well that the minister should have a plant for these special kinds of work. Then, when he has ordinary printing to do, such as any newspaper concern can turn out, let him call for tenders. He will thus get the benefit of market prices and will not be at the mercy of a few who seek to monopolize this class of work.

Mines and geological survey—Mines branch—to provide for the cost of experimental tests of low-grade magnetic iron ores with a view to making pig steel direct therefrom on a commercial basis, $10,000.

Mr. CODERRE: A committee of the members of the Geological Survey and the Mines Branch, appointed in September last, to investigate and report on the iron mining industry of Canada, and the metallurgical treatment both local and foreign that might be applicable to Canadian iron ores, recommends that a series of practical tests be made to demonstrate the possibility of making pig-steel direct from selected non-marketable ores, or ores now marketable with difficulty, and suggests that such tests be made at the Moffatt-Irving Electric Furnace, Toronto, as will best demonstrate the possibilities of a convenient method towards developing and utilizing some of the low-grade magnetic deposits of this country on a commercial basis.

The cost of this work is estimated as follows: a series of experimental furnace runs for thirty days, $3,000; labour, power, electrode consumption, $1,000; supervision, analyses, providing ore, coke flux, etc., $3,000; unforeseen expenses, $3,000; total, $10,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Where are these low-grade ores obtained?

Mr. CODERRE: In Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. MARCIL: I am told that along the shores of the St. Lawrence immense quantities of these low-grade ores can be obtained.

Mr. CODERRE: Experiments will be made with that ore.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a lot of it in the Timiskaming country.

Mr. CODERRE: When the matter came up last year, one of the parties interested in the ore industry in Ontario came here to ask for a bounty from the Government. Instead of paying a bounty the Government appointed a commission to investigate and report. This commission was composed of officials of the Mines Branch and of the Geological Survey. They made a partial report, advising the department to make experiments or tests by the Moffat-Irving process, and this amount is now asked for to provide for such experiments and tests.

Mr. GAUVREAU: From what part of Quebec is that ore obtained?

Mr. CODERRE: On the north shore, opposite Anticosti island.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Large deposits of the best iron ore can be obtained in Rimouski and Temiscouata.

Mr. CODERRE: That ore will be examined by the commission.

Adulteration of food, and the administration of the Act respecting fertilizers, fraudulent marking and commercial feeding stuffs, $51,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: How is this inspection in the matter of adulteration of foods carried on? I remember when there were officers in every town, and the officer in my own town was engaged in canvassing for my opponent practically eleven months of the year. He really did but little work in the line of inspection; he had charge of the voters' lists for the riding. How many employees has my hon. friend in this business?

Mr. BLONDIN: In all, for preventive service and survey of adulteration of foods, about 250. No report of any such condition as my hon. friend has suggested has reached me.

Mr. MARCIL: Has there been any increase in the number of inspectors?

Mr. BLONDIN: No.

Mr. MARCIL: How are these men paid?

Mr. BLONDIN: By the year.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the average salary?

Mr. BLONDIN: About $600.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the minister appoint officers in rural constituencies, or only in towns and cities?

Mr. BLONDIN: Inspectors are appointed in the cities, and make survey of the food in the various districts. Most of the inspectors live in the cities.

Mr. MARCIL: What work is performed by the ordinary inspector in the rural districts of the province of Quebec?

Mr. BLONDIN: They go around and collect all kinds of samples for analysis and inspection.

Mr. MARCIL: From merchants and farmers?

Mr. BLONDIN: From every dealer.

Mr. ROBB: Has the minister had any complaints from milkmen of inspectors stopping milk wagons on windy days, emptying a sample into a package and then sending the package to the department with the result that the milk is reported as dirty?

Mr. BLONDIN: I am not aware that anything of the kind has come to my department.

Adulteration of food, etc.—proprietary or patent medicines, $1,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are these sent to the department?

Mr. BLONDIN: No, the manufacturer has to apply for a license number and to make a declaration that the medicine does not contain certain harmful ingredients. This is in order to enable the department to follow a patent medicine in case it is found hurtful to public health.

Department of External Affairs—salaries, $27,200; contingencies, $9,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: Sir Joseph Pope is at the head of this department. What are the exact duties of the department?

Mr. ROGERS: He has charge of all diplomatic correspondence and work of that kind. He has naturally had a very busy time during the present year. It is a very busy department.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the Post Office Department had negotiations in connection with the postal service between the United States and Canada, would the Postal Department hand their brief to Sir Joseph's department and have him conduct the correspondence?

Mr. ROGERS: Not necessarily.

Mr. CASGRAIN: We do that ourselves.

Mr. ROGERS: For example, when we had the case of shooting in Ontario, Sir Joseph went to Washington and arranged the matter. He arranged a settlement there.

Mr. GRAHAM: I remember trying to have some correspondence with the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States as well as with the Imperial Government. We carried on a kind of semi-private correspondence for some time, but when it became official correspondence between the two Governments we had to hand it over to the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. ROGERS: You are quite right in that.

Office of the Conservation Commission—salaries, $39,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are there any changes in the officials of the Conservation Commission?

Mr. ROGERS: No. The commission is doing very important work and has been very active and energetic in connection with the surveying and development of the natural resources of the various parts of Canada. I believe that under Mr. White a work very valuable to the Canadian people is being carried on. Mr. White is a very energetic and active man, doing very good service.

Mr. MARCIL: Are the recommendations of this commission taken up by Council and followed, or are they merely printed and embalmed.

Mr. ROGERS: As far as I know they are always given effect to.

Mr. GRAHAM: Usually when this item is up we are given the names of the staff with their salaries and some details of their work. It is really a department of Government carried on in an semi-independent way, but the people are greatly interested in it. I had some correspondence with the commission this year myself. The sum of $39,400 is asked for in a lump without a word of information as to the personnel of staff or the work they are doing. I have

no desire to criticise the commission, but unless we have details of this kind we are not in a position to intelligently vote the amount. I am satisfied that the commission are doing a good work; but we may be asked throughout the country about men on the Conservation Commission and their duties and salaries, and unless we are able to give the information it will be thought that we do not know very much about the management of the country's affairs.

Mr. ROGERS: I will see that a detailed report from the deputy minister is placed on the table to-morrow.

Mr. ROBB: For the last few years the Conservation Commission have had throughout the country a number of demonstration farms. They get farmers to cultivate portions of their farms under the direction of superintendents employed by the commission. I understand that this year that work has been transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Can the minister tell us whether that is correct? Who paid the expenses heretofore? This amount seems rather small for the work they are doing.

Mr. ROGERS: I understand that some arrangement was arrived at between the Conservation Commission and the Department of Agriculture in order that the work should not be duplicated. but just what it was I do not know.

Miscellaneous—Expenses under the Naturalization Act, $20,000.

Mr. MARCIL: I brought up this question of naturalization some two or three weeks ago, particularly with reference to repatriating Canadians, and the Secretary of State said that he would make a statement on the subject, but he would first have to cable for certain information to England.

Mr. ROGERS: We will let the item stand until he comes in.

Miscellaneous—grant towards defraying the preliminary organization expenditure of the Canadian Peace Centenary Association—revote, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was announced that some celebrations were to take place in different localities in connection with the Centenary of Peace. Will they take place this summer?

Mr. ROGERS: Nothing has been settled. I am sure that the one-hundredth anniversary of the establishment of peace between Great Britain and her great American daughter, the United States, is a source of great satisfaction to us all. This amount is asked for to defray any expenses incidental to the celebration.

Miscellaneous—special allowance to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, to cover travelling and other expenses in connection with his services while acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, $2,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the Government ever seriously considered the question of appointing a regular representative at Washington? I do not mean a British representative, as we now have, but a Canadian one. This matter has been discussed in the House on several occasions, and different views have been expressed. Personally, I am not prepared to express any views, but I should like to know if the Government have seriously considered this matter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think that the subject has ever been very much considered, at least by the present Administration. A great many things would have to be taken into account before a proposal of that kind could be carried out. The status of any such Canadian representative in relation to the British Ambassador would involve a great deal of consideration. One of two courses would have to be adopted: one would be to attach the Canadian representative to the British Embassy, and the other would be to have an entirly separate representation. The difficulties which would arise in case either course should be adopted are sufficiently obvious to make it unnecessary for me to dwell upon the subject.

Miscellaneous—grant towards the maintenance of the experiments with reindeer in the Canadian Labrador, under the direction of Dr. W. F. Grenfell, $1,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: How big a herd of reindeer have we up there?

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid that is rather a difficult question to answer. The reindeer were introduced into that country by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of the Interior. They have been up there for a number of years, but I am afraid have not prospered very well.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have taken a little interest in this subject, and have had the advantage of reading a very interesting monograph thereon, prepared by an officer of the Department of the Interior whose name I cannot recall at the moment. It might be worth while at some later date to lay it on the table of the House for the information of the members. There has

been a good deal of correspondence on the subject, and a good many representations have been made to the Government with regard to it. If I am not mistaken, there are in the northern parts of our western country immense herds of caribou, and one gentleman who has paid a good deal of attention to the subject made what seemed to me a pretty sensible suggestion, that more could be accomplished with the caribou in that region than with the reindeer. He made the further suggestion that if some attention were given to the utilization of these herds a great supply of meat might be derived from that northern country. As far as I can recollect, the suggestion was that if the wild animals which preyed on the caribou could be checked in some effective way an enormous source of meat supply might be opened up in that northern country. I was a good deal impressed by the suggestion, but in the hurry and rush of a great many affairs demanding one's constant attention, particularly during the past year, I have not been able to give to it the consideration that it deserves, or call it to the attention of my colleagues as I wished to do.

Miscellaneous—Grant to the Medical Council of Canada, $15,000.

Mr. PROULX: When this matter came up some time ago I asked my hon. friend whether the council had made a report to the Government and he promised to make inquiries.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am afraid that I have not been able to ascertain that, but I will endeavour to do so. I did write to the gentleman who is representing the council in the absence of Dr. Roddick to obtain some information as to the disposal of these moneys, and the purposes to which they were applied. I have his letter, though not immediately under my hand, and I think he gave a reasonable explanation of the necessity for some assistance under present conditions. It is hoped that as the system becomes more general, which was inaugurated by the Bill introduced by Dr. Roddick, and as more medical practitioners avail themselves of the opportunities afforded by that Act, the funds of the Council will become very much more self-sustaining than at present. In the meantime, while examinations must continue to be held, although possibly very few people apply to be examined, it does seem necessary that some assistance should be given to the association's work. I think we all agree that the purpose to be served by the Bill and the work which the association is carrying on are very laudable.

Mr. PROULX: I have been informed that the examination fee has been $100 and that the council holds two examinations a year in different cities. If the Council is to receive a grant of $15,000 I should think that it could reduce the examination fee, and I hope it will. In addition to the fee of $100, the candidates have to undergo considerable expense to attend the examinations. At one time the examination was held at Winnipeg, and the students from the East had to travel to Winnipeg for the purpose of undergoing the examination. If the examination is held in Montreal the candidates from the West have to travel to Montreal. I hope that with the aid of this grant the association will be able to reduce by half the examination fee.

To provide for the salary of a private secretary, A. Hinds, $600, and clerical services to the Hon. J. A. Lougheed, a member of the Cabinet and leader of the Senate, $1,200.

Mr. W. T. WHITE moved that the resolution be amended to read:

To provide for the salary of a private secretary, and clerical services to the Hon. J. A. Lougheed, a member of the Cabinet and leader of the Senate, $1,200.

Mr. GRAHAM: The effect of the amendment is to strike out the name of the secretary. This may change the destination of the grant. I suppose that in reality it goes to the secretary and not to any individual.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know who the secretary is.

Mr. GRAHAM: The name is mentioned, but my hon. friend the Minister of Finance moves to strike it out.

Amendment agreed to.

British Columbia—Better Terms Commission, $40,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What about this Better Terms Commission?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There has not been a great deal of progress made since I last reported to the House on this subject. I think it would have been possible to have done so had it not been for the outbreak of the war, although at first sight there does not seem to be a great deal of relation between the one matter and the other. It was arranged that one commissioner should be appointed by the Federal Government, another by the provincial government, and that the third should be selected by the two so ap-

pointed, or, in default of their agreement, that he should be selected by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. We had some correspondence with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, his intervention having become necessary, and we were asked to indicate the length of time for which the services of the third commissioner would be required, and also some other particulars. We were in communication with the British Government on the subject shortly before the outbreak of the war. It will be perfectly apparent to hon. gentlemen that since the outbreak of the war there would be very great difficulty in securing the services of men who would be very suitable for the discharge of such duties and who would have been available under other conditions. Then some question arose with the government of the province as to the exact scope of the reference, as to which there would not have been any difficulty, I think, except that the subject became more or less submerged in view of the exceedingly pressing questions that have demanded the undivided attention of the members of the Government since the war broke out.

Mr. GRAHAM: The war has produced a peculiar situation. It has rendered the needs of the province greater and the ability of the Dominion to satisfy them less, but as there is no report from the commission I presume there is no use of discussing the matter now.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The commission is not really fully constituted for the reason I have mentioned.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand that two commissioners have been appointed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Would the right hon. gentleman have any objection to saying who they are?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Bodwell, K.C., was named by the province and Mr. Lash, K.C., by the Federal Government.

Liquidation Union Life Assurance Company—additional amount required, including charges of counsel representing the Department of Insurance at prosecution of directors, $6,606.74.

Mr GRAHAM: That is all the expense connected with it?

Mr. W. T. WHITE: That is the balance.

Mr. GRAHAM: I presume the matter has been settled satisfactorily to all parties?

Mr. WHITE: This is the balance required to pay the liquidation expenses and the fee of counsel representing the Dominion on the prosecution of certain directors of the Union Life Assurance Company. My hon. friend remembers that the Union Life had some 130,000 or 140,000 policy-holders throughout Canada, and its affairs got into a very bad condition. We threw it into liquidation and the court appointed, at our instance, an official of the Insurance Department, now the Superintendent of Insurance, Mr. Finlayson, as liquidator. At my special request as Minister of Finance, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company assumed all the policies. We felt rather obligated to them for doing so, because they paid about $400,000 more than the business was worth on an actuarial reinsurance basis. The only ground for the Dominion assuming the expenses of the liquidation was the widespread character of the disaster which would have resulted to the 130,000 or 140,000 policy-holders throughout the Dominion. The Metropolitan Life was unwilling to pay the expenses of the liquidation. The Government thought that we were justified in saying that we would assume those expenses. They have amounted to about $25,000 or $26,000. This amount of $6,606.74 will complete the payment of the expenses of liquidation.

Mr. GRAHAM: All the policy-holders are protected?

Mr. WHITE: They are all protected; they are all taken care of.

Mr. ROGERS: Would my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) renew his question about naturalization, and the Minister of Justice will give him the information?

Mr. MARCIL: I asked if there had been any change in the law affecting the naturalization of former Canadians residing in the United States who returned to Canada.

Mr. DOHERTY: Does my hon. friend refer to former Canadians who have become naturalized citizens of the United States?

Mr. MARCIL: Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY: As I understand it, under the law prior to the Naturalization Act of last year there was a special provision for a person re-acquiring British nationality who has abdicated it by naturalization in a foreign country. Under the law as enacted last year I understand that

such person would have to be naturalized now just as though he had always been an alien. The provision which dealt specially with the repatriation of persons who formerly had been British subjects has disappeared under the new Act, and the person now who has lost his British nationality by becoming naturalized in a foreign country must become naturalized as any other alien. I am speaking purely from memory on a question of law, but I think I am correct.

Department of External Affairs—to provide for the salary of one clerk in first division, subdivision B, from October 1, 1914, at $2,800 per annum, $1,400.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who is the new clerk?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: H. C. Borden, private secretary. The work in the office of the Prime Minister is ordinarily very heavy, but during the past eight months it has been exceptionally so on account of the great number of confidential telegrams and other communications despatched from day to day, and on account also of the very great work which is entailed in coding and deciphering the correspondence, which, in many cases, is of a highly confidenial character. The former secretary, Mr. A. E. Blount, who has discharged these duties, with clerical assistance, during
10 p.m. the first three years of the Administration, was much overworked, and I have found it necessary almost to station a policeman at the office door to forbid him from attendance when he was seriously indisposed. Finally Mr. Blount was practically on the point of giving up his position and seeking some other work which would be less severe, but I made an arrangement with him to stay, on condition that he would have assistance. I made application in various quarters and I have had a great deal of difficulty in securing a person with the requisite knowledge and experience and qualities for the position, but eventually I succeeded.

Office of the Auditor General—contingencies—temporary clerical assistance—further amount required, $5,000.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): Before passing this item, I deem it my duty to make a few remarks for the benefit of those authorities whom it may concern.

A certain parable in the Gospel states that it is as difficult for a thief to enter the Kingdom of Heaven as for a camel to pass through a needle's eye. I believe the Auditor General has in mind that parable in so far as his employing French Canadians in his department is concerned. At the door of his office stands a cerberus who keeps a jealous watch in order to stop any French Canadian from entering. The Civil Service list of 1913 reveals the fact that out of 90 employees in his office, only two French Canadians are to be counted. I should think that if the situation was reversed and the English-speaking employees were in such a minority, the walls of this House would crumble away under the vehemence of the remonstrances of some of my hon. friends opposite.

I deem it my duty to protest strenuously against the perpetuation of such discrimination against the French Canadians in a department of the public service. I hope the authorities who are at the head of that department will see to it that a stop is put to such a practice. I should not be astonished to be told that those two employees are merely translators or stenographers.

Miscellaneous—investigations under the Inquiries Act—further amount required, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is this in connection with the commission of which the gentleman from Newfoundland was a member?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This is merely a general vote; I do not think that it has relation to any particular inquiry.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is it for inquiries that were made last year?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think so.

Miscellaneous—to provide for the expenses of the Acting High Commissioner, London, England, $13,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Can the Prime Minister tell us now if he has made up his mind as to who is to be the permanent High Commissioner?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have been so busily occupied ever since that I have hardly been able to give the subject consideration. The office of High Commissioner has been of special service to the Government under the conditions that have prevailed during the past eight months. Of course, the status of Sir George Perley as Acting High Commissioner is different from that which has been enjoyed by any High Commissioner in the past, inasmuch as he not only discharges the duties of that position, but he is a member of the Government as well. I think that I have suggested on previous occasions, both in this House and elsewhere, that some closer form of co-operation as to certain matters

might possibly be found in adopting that as a permanent policy. Nothing that has happened during the period in which Sir George Perley has discharged very efficiently the duties of that office would lead one to the conclusion that it would not be a wise policy. I would not, however, desire to be understood as suggesting or intimating that any absolute and definite conclusion has been reached on that subject. The only thing that can be said in the meantime is that the experiment, if one can call it an experiment, has proved to be a highly successful one under the conditions which have prevailed during the past year, and that very valuable service has been rendered not only to the Dominion, but, I think, to the Empire as well, by Sir George Perley in London.

Militia and Defence—salaries and wages—further amount required, $14,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works, who, I think, is looking after this item, to a memorandum which I have received from British Columbia, and which I should like to read to him in order that he may give the committee some information on the subject. I am informed that in March, 1914, tenders for a supply of coal were called for by the Department of Militia, I think in Victoria. The contract was awarded to Messrs. Kirk & Company at $7.10 a ton. There are two other tenders, one at $6.90 and another at $6.75, so that Kirk & Co.'s tender was the highest. The lowest tenderer was not awarded the contract, but the coal to be supplied under one of the lower tenders was from the same mine as that which Kirk & Co. were supplying. Thus there can be no question of the quality of the coal. I am informed that at a meeting of coal dealers held in Victoria, Mr. Kirk admitted, in the presence of six others, that he gave a commission to the secretary of the Conservative Association of the city. That is a matter which is worthy of investigation by the Government, as it seems to me that it is very reprehensible. It is not good administration to pass over the lowest tenderer where tenders are called and give the contract to a higher tenderer.

Mr. ROGERS: What is the difference?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The lowest tender was $6.75 per ton; the next $6.90 per ton; and the next $7.10 per ton. The contract was given to Kirk & Co. at $7.10, the highest tender. That is the information which I have, and I would be glad if the minister would have the tenders submitted tomorrow. I do not like to trouble him so late in the session, but I received the information only a few days ago. This is the first time since then that any item of Militia Estimates has been under discussion.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the hon. gentleman give me the name of the party to whom the payment was said to have been made?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Are Kirk & Co. in Vancouver or in Victoria?

Mr. STEVENS: They are in Vancouver. They may be in Victoria too. Many of these firms are in both cities.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My memorandum does not say whether it is in Victoria or Vancouver. I think the letter referred to the fact that information was given to my informant while he was in Victoria. Therefore I would assume it was in Victoria.

Mr. STEVENS: I would not like for a moment to have it go on record that that occurred with the secretary of the association in Vancouver.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is Mr. Price secretary of the association in Vancouver?

Mr. STEVENS: No. I want to say most emphatically that, so far as I am concerned, we never allow anything of that type to go on. I have never had any knowledge of a practice of that kind going on in Vancouver. There are four firms in the coal business there—Evans, Coleman Evans, Macdonald & Marpole, Vancouver Coal Co., and Kirk Coal Co. They always tender at exactly the same figure, $7 a ton, on coal for the Government, and the orders are usually divided up among the four firms. The hon. member is aware that the firm of Macdonald & Marpole are strong supporters of his party, so there is no complaint on the ground of political patronage.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It must be very clear that this is Victoria, because Mr. Price is mentioned as secretary of the association.

Mr. STEVENS: That is not Vancouver.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I judge that is the case also from another statement, because it says: "If you remember, I gave you all the particulars in reference to this when you were in Victoria." My hon. friend is entirely right in insisting on that course; where tenders are called for it is a matter of obligation on the part of the department to

give the contract to the lowest tenderer, else it is a farce to call for tenders. But, as it has been stated here, the Militia Department, having called for tenders, instead of giving the contract to the lowest tenderer, gave it to the highest. A very objectionable feature of the case is that it seems to be admitted that the gentleman who got the contract made a contribution to the secretary of the Conservative Association, and people will naturally assume that this was a consideration for his insisting on the contract going to the highest tenderer. That is the inference one would naturally draw. Perhaps the minister would, to-morrow, bring down copies of the tenders with the name of the party to whom the contract was awarded?

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be glad to bring to the attention of the Militia Department to what my hon. friend has stated, and to have placed on the table to-morrow their explanation.

Mr. CARVELL: Before this vote passes, I want to ask a question of the Prime Minister. Perhaps this is not the proper time to do it, but I am not able to be in the House frequently. What method was adopted in paying Canadian soldiers in England? Were they paid by our own cheques or was the money sent to England and paid there? The reason for asking this is that I have received a letter from a constituent enclosing an original letter written by a soldier to a friend in New Brunswick. This soldier says:

> There is a general kick among Canadians in general about pay. They cheat us out of 15 shillings to 18 shillings every month and tell us that it takes that much of every man's pay to pay for the exchange on Canadian money to England. You know and everybody else knows that it don't take that much. Somebody is making quite a fortune out of us fellows.

I shall send the letter to the Prime Minister if he wishes to see it. It is an ordinary letter written to New Brunswick. It was sent me by a gentleman in New Brunswick to find out what it means. I had supposed that the money would be transferred to England and paid there in English money, but evidently some other course has been adopted.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did make some inquiry as to the system of payment carried out in regard to men at the front. A Mr. Ward, who had had considerable experience, I believe, as paymaster in the navy and who some years ago was appointed Assistant Accountant General and Paymaster in the Department of Militia, was sent to Great Britain with the first expeditionary force to act as overseas paymaster with headquarters in London. The Department of Militia places sums to the credit of the High Commissioner's office, requisitions are made upon the High Commissioner's office by the overseas paymaster general and he transmits the sums to the regimental paymaster. I understand there is a paymaster for each regiment. The regimental paymasters attend to the payment of the men.

Mr. CARVELL: It would seem then that they would be actually paid in English money.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would understand so.

Mr. CARVELL: This letter is dated as late as March 21. Has the Prime Minister had this question brought to his attention before, or has he received any protest?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No. I have not had the subject brought to my personal attention before. It may have been brought to the attention of the Minister of Militia, but not to my attention.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope the Premier will look into the matter, because if it be true, and I have no doubt at all from the tone of the letter that it is true, there is evidently mismanagement somewhere.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am obliged to my hon. friend for bringing the matter to my attention. If he will send me the letter I will transmit it at once to the paymaster of the Department of Militia and ask for a statement from him in regard to it.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN (translation): Before this item is passed I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister a question. Has he received a letter from the mayor of Montreal in which I requested him to do something to help the "out of works" in that city?

I do not know whether the Hon. Prime Minister has received that letter, but this I can say, it remains without reply to this day. I should very much like to know why.

I have spoken in French because my right hon. friend understands that language. I have had no answer to that letter which, as mayor of Montreal, I wrote to my right hon. friend.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I remember receiving it, but, as my hon. friend had pub-

lished it as an open letter, I did not understand that he expected any reply; and for that reason, and without the slightest desire to be discourteous, I did not reply.

Mr. MARTIN: I think the least thing my right hon. friend could have done was to answer. I was rather surprised at not hearing from him, because every letter calls for an answer.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not really understand it in that way, because my hon. friend published it as an open letter. It appeared in the papers, I think, before I received it. So I suppose it would be proper for me to regard it in that sense, and not as an ordinary letter written from one gentleman to another, and which of course would demand a reply.

Mr. MARTIN: The object of the letter was to induce the Prime Minister to do something for the unemployed of Montreal. I am 46 years of age, but this is the first time I have written a letter to a gentleman, especially the Prime Minister of Canada, without getting a reply.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would also say that this is almost the first time that I ever received a letter which had first been published in the papers of the country.

Mr. MARTIN: My letter contained a suggestion to the Prime Minister to bring down some legislation to help the unemployed of the city of Montreal, where there are 50,000 men out of work. If I could be here every day I would have brought the matter up in the House myself.

(Translation.) I would like to mention here, that in my official position as mayor of Montreal, I am the representative of one-seventh of the entire population of Canada and it seems to me that I am at least entitled to a reply from the hon. Prime Minister.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I appreciate the importance of any communication from my hon. friend acting in his capacity as Mayor of Montreal. Because I did not make a reply to the letter, for the reason already mentioned, I do not wish him to think that I did not give my best consideration to his representations. I have been in communication with the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, and also with my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, for the purpose of endeavouring to provide as far as possible any work for the unemployed in Montreal. I am sure my hon. friend realizes the difficulties of the situation—one which has been experienced not only by municipalities, cities and provinces, but generally, under the difficult financial conditions which have prevailed since the outbreak of the war.

Mr. MARTIN: Another open letter was sent to the Prime Minister by Commissioner MacDonald, and according to the newspapers it was answered, although perhaps we should not believe all that the newspapers say. This was two or three days afterwards.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend's letter was the first.

Militia and Defence—Gratuities to professors of the Royal Military College on retirement, $15,190.

Mr. PUGSLEY: On what grounds are gratuities given to professors retiring?

Mr. ROGERS: This is simply following the usual practice. Professor Butler and one or two others have retired this year.

Special allowance to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, to cover travelling and other expenses in connection with his services while acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General—Omitted from Main Estimates, $2,500.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This is necessary on account of the item in the Main Estimates not being the usual amount that has been granted of late years. I think the amount has been $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have never understood that $5,000 was allowed. I understand that the duties of deputy to His Excellency the Governor General simply mean attending the opening and closing of Parliament. I think $2,500 is the usual amount, but possibly it may be more.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will get the Estimates of last year, and endeavour to look it up.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let the item pass, and my right hon. friend find out afterwards.

To provide for the salary of a private secretary, and clerical services to the Hon. J. A. Lougheed, a member of the Cabinet and leader of the Senate (payment may be made to a member of the Senate staff notwithstanding the Civil Service Act)—further amount required, $600.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is in addition?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It seems to be the $600 which is usually allowed to private secretaries in addition to their salary as clerks.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps before we rise the Prime Minister would give the explanation he promised in reference to the Northwest Mounted Police?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The amount of $60,000 is explained to me by the Comptroller of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police as follows. It consists of three items: The first item of $40,000 is to provide for the expenses of the Baker lake expedition undertaken to inquire into the murder of Messrs. Radford and Street by Eskimo in 1913. The sending of this expedition was not decided upon until after the Estimates for the current fiscal year had been prepared and passed, and the expenditure, including the purchase of a schooner, amounted to $40,000. I made some explanation in regard to this matter last year. These two men were murdered in the North, and after a good deal of consideration of the subject, and after I had consulted with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), we decided to adopt this course instead of undertaking to arrest the Eskimo. There was evidence which had come to us from reliable quarters that the men who unfortunately met their fate there had contributed probably to the result by undertaking unusual punishment of some of these Eskimo. I have looked into the report of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police as to the expedition but it does not seem that any report has yet been made; at all events it is not in this year's report.

Then there is an item of $10,000 for transport. Owing to the outbreak of the war and to looking after the alien enemies in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the item of $50,000 for transport, included in the current year's Estimates, was found insufficient and a further sum of $10,000 is required to complete this service. There is another item of $10,000 for billeting, subsistence and forage. The price of provisions both where men are billeted and for those living in barracks, has increased considerably owing to the outbreak of the war and the failure of the crops in certain portions of the provinces has caused an increase in the rate of both hay and oats. The sum of $10,000 is required to complete this service. These three items make up the total of $60,000 which is asked.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Royal Northwest Mounted Police are a body of men who are a credit to this country. It is really beyond the comprehension of strangers to understand how the presence of one member of the Mounted Police force in a locality in the west maintains order. I have been through that western country and where great crowds were gathered two mounted police would be enough to maintain order, whereas, in the eastern country, you would require a dozen or more to do the same work.

Mr. ROGERS: They are all very well behaved.

Mr. GRAHAM: When the Mounted Police are present I suppose they are, and no doubt at other times also. The Mounted Police have no superiors in the world.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am very much obliged to my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) for his appreciation, in which I entirely agree. As I stated in an earlier part of the session, the men who were recruited to the number of 500 last summer have proved to be a very fine body of men who, in their training and discipline, have made excellent progress and are well up to the standard of the former force.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: Mr. Chairman, will you permit me to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to an item in the Main Estimates of $15,000 for the construction of a post office at St. Jacques l'Achigan in my riding? When his Estimates were up I brought this matter to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General, and he was kind enough to refer me to the Minister of Public Works, who, he said, was very kind, obliging and just, with the assurance that I would succeed in securing his assent to the construction of this post office. In 1909, when I was elected for Montcalm, the late member for that riding, Mr. Dugas, now judge of the superior court of the district of Joliet, asked me very earnestly to see to the completion of that building. A vote of $15,000 was passed but to my great surprise that sum was taken away in the following sesion of 1911. I asked to have it replaced in the Estimates, but I had no success. In 1912 I came back and asked the same thing with no success. It was only in 1913 that the then Postmaster General, now a judge of the superior court of Montreal, at my request, replaced the item of $15,000. Still, there has been no construction. A lot was bought and paid for, the plans were made, everything was ready and I was waiting for the tenders to be called for but no tenders have been called for yet. I would like to appeal to the justice of the Minister of Public Works and to ask him to order the construction of that building. St. Jacques l'Achigan is a

very large and a very nice place. There are two banks, one college, a tobacco manufactory, and a good population, and it is altogether a very flourishing place. The Administration having decided that this post office should be put up, I think that this Parliament might do me the favour I ask. I do not want the building for myself. I am living in Jacques Cartier near Montreal, and I do not need a post office for my correspondence but I simply ask that the building be erected as a matter of justice to my electors. I hope that the hon. gentleman, who is here to do justice to every one, will see that the building is soon put up. I draw his attention again to it.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sure that I appreciate the generous appeal of my hon. friend (Mr. Lafortune) in regard to this post office, and I am glad to know that he does not require the building for his own particular use. I am afraid that he is a little in error when he says that the first time that this item appeared in the Estimates was in 1909. I think that if he will look up the Estimates he will see that it appeared previously to that. It did not appear to meet with much success for evidently my predecessor thought that in view of the fact that so little attention was paid to the construction of the work it should be dropped from the Estimates. However, my hon. friend was very pressing in his representations from time to time and he succeeded in having that amount replaced in the Estimates in 1913. It is true that at the close of last session, some time in June, this matter was under discussion and it was hoped at that time that we would be able to prepare the plans and go on with the construction of the building. But little work was under way before the 1st August and this building was in the same position as several others in various parts of the country. From that time on very little new work has been undertaken, but I can assure my hon. friend that whenever the opportunity presents itself, and I trust it will be in the near future, we will undertake to provide for the requirements of the locality of which he speaks in the matter of post office accommodation.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: I might make another remark in justice to the late Minister of Public Works, my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). Everything was ready before the election of 1911 and the tenders were to be called for but there was a difference as to the line between the lot that the Government had purchased and the neighbouring property. The department was ready to call for tenders, but a dispute arose between the Government and the adjoining proprietor which prevented that. I am thankful to you, Mr. Minister, and having heard of your good disposition I know that you will keep your word, and I will find my post office erected before the general election.

Mr. ROGERS: I can assure my hon. friend that he can absolutely depend upon it, that he will probably be in a little better position at the next general election than he was at the last.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When I was Minister of Public Works the necessity for a public building in this town was strongly pressed on me, and after giving it most careful attention, I concluded that the town, because of its population and importance, was much more entitled to a public building than many others which had secured public buildings. I had an appropriation put in the Estimates and I actually purchased the site, but delay was caused by some legal dispute which arose regarding the boundaries of the property. Had it not been for the unfortunate result of the election, that building would have been erected long ago.

Resolutions reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider certain resolutions reported this day from the Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not the usual practice to receive a report from the Committee of Supply on the same day as that on which the resolutions have been agreed to in the committee, but it is stated in Bourinot that at the end of a session, when there is urgency, it is occasionally done in the Canadian Parliament, though never in the English Parliament. I think it well to let the House have knowledge of what is being done.

Mr. GRAHAM: That was my understanding, but the Clerk of the House informed me that it was customary in the Canadian Parliament, near the close of the session, and that it was done last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: With the unanimous consent of the House.

Resolutions concurred in.

WAR SUPPLIES—PURCHASE OF BOOTS.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey) presented the report of the Special Committee to which was referred the report of the Board of Inquiry respecting boots supplied to the Department of Militia and Defence, and all matters pertaining to such boots.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. Saturday.

Saturday, April 10, 1915.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF ACCOUNTANT.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker, laid on the table of the House on the 9th inst., respecting the appointment of Mr. Douglas W. Cameron to the position of Chief Accountant of the House of Commons, was concurred in.

COMMISSION OF CONSERVATION.

STATEMENT OF THE YEAR'S WORK.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps I might be permitted to give to the House some information with regard to the Commission of Conservation, which was asked for while we were in Supply, but which was not available at the moment. The following memorandum has been handed to me by the secretary of the Commission:

The work to be carried on in 1915-16 can best be described as being, substantially, a continuation of that undertaken during the year which has just elapsed, although investigatory work of a nature not entered upon heretofore is being instituted by one of two committees and later developments may further modify the proposed work. In 1914-15, investigations have been carried out under the direction of the various committees as follows:

Waters and Water-powers.

The preparation of reports based on information secured by field work conducted by the commission in preceding years constituted the main task of this committee during 1914-15. Mr. Denis has been engaged in assembling and arranging in proper form the material to be embodied in a comprehensive report on the water-powers of Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Alberta. The collecting and collating of data from all available sources to supplement that obtained from reconnaissance surveys has been a task of considerable magnitude. The report is now being passed through the press, as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Denis has practically completed the preparation of a second edition of "Water-Works of Canada," which, it is anticipated, will be published early in the ensuing year. In addition to the original material, revised and corrected, the new edition includes information relative to sewerage and sewage disposal.

Special effort has been made to advance the completion of the proposed report dealing with the water-powers of British Columbia. The work of collecting data has been completed and Mr. A. V. White will direct his attention to the preparation of the manuscript for the printer.

Forests.

Early in the past year, the Trent watershed report was issued. It is of special value in respect to the conservation of the water-supply of the Trent canal and of the water-powers along the Trent river. The area selected also typifies the large portion of central Ontario which has been nearly denuded of forest wealth; fires have raged practically unchecked and nothing has been done in the way of reforestation, although the agricultural resources are known to be extremely limited.

During the past summer, Dr. Whitford and Mr. Craig continued the inventory of British Columbia's forest resources commenced in 1913. Data respecting over 200,000 square miles has now been secured. During the summer, Mr. J. C. Blumer was engaged on similar work in Saskatchewan. In British Columbia, the provincial forestry branch, and, in Saskatchewan, the Dominion forestry branch are giving valuable assistance. It is hoped to complete this work in the coming year.

Dr. Howe has submitted a report embodying the results of his studies undertaken in the summer of 1913, with special reference to the rate of growth of timber trees and to the damage done by the disastrous fires of 1913 in the Trent regions. It will be published shortly together with the results of an investigation conducted last summer by Dr. Howe to determine the most favourable conditions for the reproduction of commercial tree species in the coastal regions of British Columbia, more particularly of Douglas fir, the most valuable and most widely-distributed species in the province. Dr. Howe emphasizes that reliance cannot be placed on nature alone to provide adequately for the replacement of commercial forests on cut-over and burned-over areas.

As chief fire inspector of the Railway Commission, the chief forester, Mr. Leavitt, has again supervised the patrol work of the railway lines of western Canada, the immediate supervision being entrusted to the field staff of the Forestry Branch of the Department of the Interior, and of the chief forester of British Columbia. In organizing this work throughout the Dominion, co-operation has been effected with the governmental fire-protective forces of every province, except Nova Scotia. Through the action of the provincial governments and through the reorganization of the Canadian Northern railway system, nearly all provincially chartered lines have been subjected to fire-protective requirements similar to those

imposed by the Railway Commission upon lines operating under Domnion charters.

Public Health.

The outstanding feature of the work of this committee last year was the development of town-planning activities. In May the commission acted as host to the National Town Planning Association at the convention held in Toronto. During the early part of the year, Dr. Hodgetts was engaged chiefly in the study of town-planning legislation until called in September to take the place of Colonel Burland as Canadian Red Cross Commissioner to England. His absence has necessitated the temporary abandonment of public health work of the nature usually undertaken. Subsequent to the convention in May, it was decided to create a town-planning branch of the commission, and the services of Mr. Thomas Adams, the foremost English authority on the subject, were engaged. Since taking up his duties in October, Mr. Adams has been investigating Canadian problems and conditions and has conducted an educational and publicity campaign. His services and advice have been eagerly sought by municipal and provincial bodies.

Lands.

An agricultural survey has again been carried on, the work being conducted along the same lines, in the same districts and by practically the same staff as in 1913.

The illustration farms, thirty-three in number, have been carried on as in the previous year. The travelling instructors visited the farms as often as possible to confer with and discuss methods and results with the farmer on each one. During the summer months, meetings were held on many of the farms and the work undertaken by the farmers was closely supervised and inspected. As the purpose of the commission has been achieved in placing this illustration work on a sound basis, the farms have been turned over to and will hereafter be conducted by the Department of Agriculture. The commission intends to continue the survey work, although along lines somewhat different from those hitherto followed.

During recent months the agriculturists of the commission's staff have participated in the platform work connected with the "patriotism and production" campaign.

Mining.

A report on "conservation of coal in Canada" was published early in the fiscal year. During the year, substantial progress has been made by Mr. Dick on a power survey of Canada. The information collected will be published in a report showing the amount, proportion, source, cost and purpose of utilization of the various kinds of power, water, steam, electric, etc. The completion of the report will require the greater portion of the ensuing year. During 1914, the mining engineer has furnished brief reports relative to briquetting of coal in Western Canada, mine-rescue work, first-aid, trade with Germany, etc.

Fish, Game and Fur-Bearing Animals.

A third edition of "fur-farming in Canada" has been issued. Two editions of this report, first published in 1913, had been quickly exhausted and the third edition, thoroughly revised and somewhat enlarged, has met with a heavy demand despite the check imposed upon the expansion of the fur-farming industry by present financial conditions.

Special attention has recently been paid by the editorial staff to fisheries questions, particularly to a publicity campaign to popularize the use of fish for food purposes. In the ensuing fiscal year, the committee intends to prosecute active study of practical fisheries problems.

Press and Co-Operative Associations.

The value of the commission's investigatory work depends largely upon efficiency in publishing and distributing reports embodying the results of the field investigations. During the ensuing year the publishing work will be unusually heavy. Manuscript for the following reports is now either being passed through the press or undergoing final preparation for that purpose: Sixth Annual Report, Water-Powers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, Forest Protection in Canada, 1914, Water-Works of Canada (2nd edition), Water--Powers of British Columbia, and Power Survey of Canada. In addition to these bound reports, two periodical bulletins, Conservation, a monthly, and Conservation of Life, a bi-monthly, are published and widely circulated.

I beg to submit herewith the estimates for salaries for the Commission of Conservation for the fiscal year, 1915-16, which includes recommendations for increase of salary.

The present staff, with salaries recommended for 1915-16, consists of:

	1914-15.	1915-16.
White, James, assistant to chairman and deputy head	$ 5,000 00	$ 5,000 00
Leavitt, Clyde, chief forester and chief fire inspector to Railway Commission	2,900 00	3,000 00
Master, Oliver, assistant secretary and editor	2,800 00	2,800 00
Denis, L. G., hydro-electric engineer	2,475 00	2,575 00
Dick, W. J., mining engineer	2,475 00	2,575 00
Nunnick, F. C., expert agriculturist	2,400 00	2,500 00
———, fisheries expert	2,200 00	2,300 00
———, assistant agriculturist	2,100 00	2,200 00
Grindlay, Thos., draughtsman	1,812 50	1,862 50
Baldwin, P. M., assistant editor	1,800 00	1,850 00
Donnell, A., assistant editor	1,700 00	1,750 00
Johnston, Miss N. F., secretary to assistant to chairman	900 00	950 00
Macdonald J. A., clerk in charge of Distribution.	900 00	950 00
Grange, Miss H., librarian	900 00	950 00
Morris, Miss O., accountant	900 00	950 00
Campbell, Miss I., clerk.	700 00	750 00
Hawkins, Miss L., Stenographer	700 00	750 00
Pepper, Miss N., stenographer	650 00	700 00
Burwash, Miss L., stenographer	637 50	687 50
———, stenographer.	600 00	650 00

Miss A. Beaulieu, stenographer	600 00	650 00
McElroy, Miss K., stenographer	600 00	650 00
———, stenographer	500 00	550 00
Carroll, James, messenger and packer	600 00	650 00
O'Connor, W. J., messenger and packer	550 00	600 00
Corp, F. J., messenger and packer	500 00	550 00
	$37,900 00	$39,400 00

MILITIA COAL PURCHASES IN VICTORIA.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): I desire to make a statement in reference to a memorandum read by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) last night in respect to tenders which it had been represented to him had been called for in Victoria for supplying coal to the Militia Department, and which stated that the lowest tender had not been accepted. I asked the department for a statement in connection with the matter, and have received the following:

The last contract made was for the twelve months beginning April 1, 1914. In February, 1914, tenders were invited by newspaper advertisement, the last day for receiving tenders being March 10, 1914. The only tender received at that date was that of Kirk and Company, Limited of Victoria, whose tender was accepted at the following prices: Washed nut, $6 per ton; Smith's coal, $10 per ton; steam coal, slack, $3.55 per ton; steam coal, double screened, $7 per ton; run of mine, $6.75 per ton; screened house coal, $7.10 per ton.

Three other tenders were received late, on the 16th March. These were as follows:

J. E. Painter and Son: Washed nut, $5.75 per ton; Smith's coal, $10 per ton; steam coal, slack, $3.50 per ton; steam coal, double screened, $6.75 per ton; run of mine $6.45 per ton.

Victoria Fuel Company: Washed nut, $6.15 per ton; steam coal, slack, $3.65 per ton; steam coal, double screened, $6.93 per ton; run of mine, $6.45 per ton.

J. Kingham and Company: Washed nut, $6 per ton; steam coal slack, $3.50 per ton; steam coal, double screened, $6.75 per ton; run of mine, $6.50 per ton.

Tenders for the new contract for the year beginning April 1, 1915, were invited in the usual way, by newspaper advertisement, in March last, the last days for receiving tenders being the 25th and 28th March. Tenders were duly received, opened and scheduled; but owing to extreme pressure of other work, no contracts have yet been made.

H. W. Brown,
Director of Contracts.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

ROYAL NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should like to give some information in respect to an inquiry made by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) on Monday, the 22nd of March last, with regard to members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police who, as he understood, had volunteered and gone to the front on active service. The Comptroller of the Royal North-West Mounted Police has given me the following memorandum on the subject, which is in accordance with the information I then had.

(1) No members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police are serving with the forces at the front. The duties of the police in preserving law and order in the provinces and looking after the alien enemies rendered it impossible to allow them to volunteer for service in the war and all applications were refused.

(2) At the outbreak of the war an Imperial proclamation was issued calling upon all Imperial reservists, both of the Navy and Army, to report themselves for service with the colours, and 54 army reservists then serving in the police were granted free discharge for that purpose and their expenses from the west were borne by the Imperial Government. Two non-commissioned officers who previously held commissions in the Imperial Army, were, on the assurance of the War Office that they would be re-commissioned, granted a free discharge.

SASKATOON POST OFFICE SITE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. OLIVER: On behalf of the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) I should like to remind the Minister of Public Works that he promised to give certain information in regard to a post office site at Saskatoon.

Mr. ROGERS: The site in Saskatoon was purchased on February 24, 1914, from Anthony Legum, for $122,500.

Mr. OLIVER: I think the hon. member also wanted to know what payments had been made on the property to date.

Mr. ROGERS: I understand the whole amount has been paid.

Mr. OLIVER: He also wanted to know what progress had been made in dredging in Saskatoon.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not remember that he asked me for that information, but I will look it up.

SUSPENSION OF LIQUOR MANUFACTURE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. MACDONALD: I have received a number of resolutions from different bodies in the province of Nova Scotia asking for a suspension of the manufacture of liquors during the war. Has the right hon. the Prime Minister received a copy of any of these resolutions; and, if so, has he any statement to make?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have received a number of such resolutions from Nova Scotia, and I think from other parts of the Dominion, but at present I have no statement to make on the subject.

REPRESENTATION IN SENATE AND HOUSE OF CMMONS.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF B. N. A. ACT.

The House proceeded to consider a message from the Senate relating to the joint Address to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, praying him that he may be graciously pleased to give his consent to submitting a measure to the Parliament of the United Kingdom to amend certain provisions of the British North America Act, 1867.—Sir Robert Borden.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): This order relates to a matter that was under consideration by this House and by the Senate last session as well as this session. The resolution which was passed by this House on both occasions prayed that certain amendments should be made to the British North America Act, 1867, by which a new division or district for the purpose of representation in the Senate should be constituted by the four western provinces of Canada, and that each of these provinces should be represented in the Senate by six members instead of the number that is now assigned to each of them. The address also prayed that the British North America Act should be amended by providing that a province shall always be entitled to a number of members in the House of Commons not less than the number of senators representing such province. The address passed the House of Commons unanimously in 1914 and also passed the House of Commons without dissent when it was introduced a few weeks ago. In 1914 the Senate modified the resolution by a certain provision which declared that the Act should not take effect until the termination of the now existing Parliament. For reasons which I then communicated to the House, and to which I still adhere, I asked the House not to concur in the amendment which the Senate proposed, and this House, without any dissent whatever, concurred in that view, and a message was accordingly sent to the Senate, who adhered to the opinion expressed in the message which they had sent to us. So the question dropped at the last session.

The matter now under consideration is a message from the Senate in which they propose an amendment almost but not quite in the terms of their amendment of last year. They propose to add to the resolution a section to be number 3 in the amended Bill, which is as follows:

> The first section of this Act, paragraph 1 to 6 inclusive, shall not take effect until the termination of the now existing Canadian Parliament.

The difference, if there be any difference, between the amendment proposed by the Senate last year and the amendment which they now propose is that the postponement affects the number of senators in the western provinces but does not affect the proposal in regard to the representation in the House of Commons. As I have already said, I adhere to the views which I expressed in this House and elsewhere as to the action of the Senate last year being undesirable and without good reason; but it seems apparent that the majority of the Senate are determined to insist upon the postponement which they desire, for a very obvious reason. Under the circumstances, as it seems impossible to get desirable and necessary legislation passed without an amendment which we think entirely unnecessary and to a certain extent obstructive, I am disposed to accept the Senate amendment; and therefore I move:

> That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House doth concur in the amendments made by the Senate to the joint address to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, praying that he may be graciously pleased to give his consent to submitting a measure to the Parliament of the United Kingdom to amend certain provisions of the British North America Act, 1867.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My right hon. friend has just stated that it is with some reluctance that he has agreed to the amendment which was suggested last year and renewed this year by the Senate. It is with some reluctance also that I agree to the motion that we should accede to the amendment made by the Senate, not, however, for the reasons which have been

stated by my right hon. friend, but for another reason—because the Senate this year has incorporated in the resolution another amendment which was not in the resolution of last year, and which is to this effect:

> Nothing herein contained shall affect the powers of the Parliament of Canada under the British North America Act, 1867.

By this amendment the powers which are conferred upon the Canadian Parliament by the Act of 1886 are continued. Without this amendment I apprehend that the Act of 1886 would not have been kept in force. The Act of 1886 is very wide in its terms, and in some respects, however useful it may be, in my opinion it goes further than it should go. The Act of 1886 provides for admitting new provinces into the Dominion and also for giving representation to the territories which have not yet been organized as provinces. To this I have no objection at all; but it has always seemed to me that the powers which were conferred upon the Parliament of Canada are altogether too great in that the Act puts no limit whatever upon the discretion of Parliament as to the representation of these territories in the Dominion Parliament. By the terms of that Act, no limit is put upon the number of senators and members who can be given to the territories. It would seem to me, then, that the representation which was given to the territories in 1887 was altogether out of proportion to their actual population. In this respect the Act has always seemed to me to be deficient, and as this deficiency is continued in this legislation, in my judgment the Senate has taken some responsibility upon itself, which for my part I would have been disposed to dispute. But still, as my right hon. friend has said, this is a matter upon which we cannot all have our own way, and I am disposed to agree to the resolution.

To the other part of the resolution to which my right hon. friend has just agreed I take some exception, and I certainly object to the insinuation—I emphasize the word—which he made when he said that the Senate added the paragraph to which we are now agreeing "for obvious reasons." I do not admit that there is any occasion for such a slur—if my hon. friend will pardon me the expression—upon the Upper Chamber. It has been intimated in the press, and I think my right hon. friend rather conveyed the impression also, that the amendment of the Senate would postpone the appointment of senators until after the next election, implying that if there were a change in the verdict of the people the appointment of senators would be by the incoming Administration. Such is not the case. The appointment can be made immediately after dissolution, as my right hon. friend well knows, and there is therefore no necessity of postponing the appointment of the six senators until after the general election. The object of the Act that we passed last year was to increase the representation of the House of Commons in the new provinces, and it seemed to me reasonable that the representation should be increased in both chambers at the same time. This view was taken by the Senate, and I think everybody must on reflection agree that there is a good deal in favour of it. However, this is an academic debate, because, after all, both parties have agreed to the resolution and it will become law. The position of the Government is not in any way prejudiced; they can make the appointments as soon as Parliament is dissolved.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): Seldom, if ever, in the history of this Parliament, for the forty-eight years of its existence, have the elected representatives of the free people of Canada been faced with a more humiliating condition than that which faces us to-day, in the consideration of the message from the Senate now before us. The position is humiliating, Mr. Speaker, beyond description, by reason of the fact that although we are elected representatives of the free people of Canada we are not to be allowed to carry out our form of democratic government under our own constitution and our own law, by reason of the action of the Senate. That means, if it means anything, that our constitution and our law are to be set at defiance to suit the purposes and the will of the majority of the Upper Chamber, which, I presume, is in keeping with the principles which my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, represents. Our constitution has been approved, as hon. gentlemen well know, times without number by the Canadian people; our constitution carries the stamp of the approval of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain as well, and under that constitution we have laid down for our guidance the form under which senators are to be appointed. Let me say to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that his statement of the representation in both

Houses should go together is not in keeping with the law and the constitution of our country. Under our constitution, there is provided in section 51 of the British North America Act the conditions under which this Parliament is to have its representation re-adjusted at certain specified times. Under clauses 24 and 25 of the British North America Act the Governor General, with the approval of His Majesty, under the great seal of Canada, has the right to name who shall be appointed to the Senate and when they shall be appointed. But, Sir, the message from the Senate which we are obliged to accept to-day, places at defiance that law, and places at defiance the right of the Governor-General, with the approval of the King, under the great seal of Canada, to make appointments to the Senate, and for no other purpose save and except the purpose of advancing the principles which hon. gentlemen opposite represent in this country. In order to do this the Senate has set at defiance the free will of the Canadian people.

The right hon. gentleman has stated that the insinuation of the Prime Minister with respect to the upper chamber was uncalled for. But what are the facts? We had before us a year ago in this House of Commons the question of the redistribution of seats, and while we were considering that measure we were told in the most explicit and express terms: that if a satisfactory arrangement were arrived at in respect to redistribution of seats in the House of Commons, the proposals for increased representation in the Senate would be agreed to, or otherwise it would be opposed. The manner in which we carried out the arrangement for the re-adjustment of seats in the House of Commons is within the knowledge of every member of this House. It is well known that we carried out that redistribution in an honourable and creditable manner. We on this side of the House took the ground that there never was a time in the history of this country when we were afraid to meet the free will of the people upon any fair redistribution of seats. That was our position then; that is our position to-day. We yielded liberally and generously to the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite in respect to the redistribution of seats, but they failed to carry out their part of the contract. The leader of the Opposition knows that the Prime Minister trusted hon. gentlemen opposite; trusted them that good faith would be kept, but good faith was not kept, and good faith is not being kept to-day.

These are the conditions of which we have to complain, because, when my right hon. friend states that the representation in the upper Chamber and the representation in this Chamber should go hand in hand, he takes an entirely different position from the one which he took last year when this matter was under consideration; for when the message came back from the Senate last year, my right hon. friend said that appointments to the Upper Chamber bore no relation whatever to the election of members to this Chamber. He said also that the majority in the Upper Chamber were unable to give any good reason why they were taking the course which they did in defeating the will of the Canadian people as represented in this chamber, and this is the stand which my right hon. friend and every hon. member sitting behind him took in this House last year when they sent that message back to the Senate unapproved. He said further:

> Appointments to the Senate have no necessary or appropriate relation to the date of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons.
>
> In respect of certain of the western provinces the proposed increase of representation in the Senate has relation solely to the result of the last decennial census, which result has been ascertained.
>
> The said amendment is inappropriate and incongruous.
>
> No sufficient reason can be adduced for the delay effected by the said amendment.

This was my right hon. friend's position last year, and we would like to know why he has changed and why he to-day approves the action of the majority in the upper chamber in setting at defiance the law and the constitution of this great Dominion?

We have heard something in this House about German autocracy. If in this Parliament and out of it we have condemned what we call German autocracy, we have done so because of certain statements and certain actions of the Emperor of Germany; and as far as I have been able to learn, no statement ever made by the Kaiser of Germany has been more strongly condemned by the people of the United Kingdom than the one he made about a year ago when he attended the launching and christening of one of his great battleships, when he used the following words:

> The ocean teaches us that on its waves and its most distant shores no great decision can be come to hereafter without the consent of Germany and the Kaiser.

In that strong statement the Kaiser was willing to acknowledge the support and the

rights of Germany herself; but what have we in our own Canadian Parliament? We have a condition that outclasses the autocratic rule of the German Emperor himself, because we have here the action of the upper chamber which, in dealing with this matter in defiance of our laws and constitution, which provide that representatives are to be appointed from time to time to the Upper Chamber upon the recommendation of the Governor General approved by the King and under the seal of this great Dominion, says that notwithstanding that we have observed this provision, the great seal of Canada, the Governor General and the King must not be allowed to carry out the provisions of our constitution because the upper chamber believe that in this matter there is a political advantage to a party in this Dominion. It is a sorry condition for the people of this Dominion. But we are told that there is a time when that autocracy may be abandoned. My right hon. friend has told us this morning that that day and that hour will come with the dissolution of this Parliament. His declaration means that until then we cannot under our constitution carry out our form of democratic government in Canada, and that we are unable to give effect to the free will of the Canadian people by reason of the action of the Upper Chamber. Is it, then, any wonder that the cry comes, from every individual that one meets and that understands the conditions, in tones louder than thunder, demanding that this Parliament be dissolved and that the rights and liberties of the people of this Dominion be granted to them under our form of democracy, and that that form of democracy be restored to them?

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any public reason why the vacancies now existing in the Senate have not been filled?

Mr. ROGERS: None whatever.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to have an answer to that question if it can be answered.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will give an answer to my hon. friend presently.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): It is not often that the Minister of Public Works favours us with such an outburst of oratory as he has done on this occasion, and I am sure we all appreciate very much what he has said.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I hope you will also profit by it.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. OLIVER: We will profit by it in due course. It almost strikes one, in view of the appeals which my hon. friend has made to the spirit of democracy and the suggestions which he has given of the necessity of an appeal to that democracy at an early date, that something has occurred that, in his capacity as minister of elections has struck him near the solar plexus, and has caused the outburst we have heard. My hon. friend's complaint I understood to be addressed rather against this side of the House and the leader of the Opposition. May I suggest to him that his complaint was not properly directed; that it should have been directed against the fathers of Confederation, who were the parties guilty of establishing the conditions which he finds so objectionable at the present moment. If we have not now in this country that democracy for which he cries, it is because the Fathers of Confederation saw fit to constitute a Parlia- cries, it is because the fathers of Con- should have certain established authority.

My hon. friend's complaint is that one of these bodies has exercised the authority with which it is vested. I am not at the moment going to question whether the fathers of Confederation acted wisely or unwisely; whether their establishment of the Senate, with its authority, was in the interests of democracy or not, but I do say that the Senate was established for certain definite and special reasons relating to the government of this country, and that unless there had been a Senate with such authority as has been given to it and with such authority as it has exercised, there could not have been any Confederation. Because the Senate has exercised its authority within the limits which are constitutionally unquestionable, my hon. friend declares not that he proposes to move that the Senate be abolished; not that he proposes that this bar against the full exercise of the privilege of democracy shall be removed, but that the leader of the Opposition has, in some way, controlled the Senate and caused it to stand in the way of the realization of my hon. friend's proposals. That is a matter which he must settle with the Senate in due course, and with the people of Canada in due course. Every senator is appointed under certain specific rights and privileges, and no body of men exercising authority in this or any other country is so absolutely independent of any possible outside influence as is the Senate of Canada. When my hon. friend suggests that the majority in the Senate of Canada are under the direc-

tion of anybody else, it is because he and they are like-minded in regard to what is right and what is wrong. When my hon. friend, in the exercise of his authority, because he has a parliamentary majority behind him, undertakes, in the slang of the day, to put something over the people of Canada, and finds that he cannot do it, he rages and blames the leader of the Opposition. Let him blame his proposals, which do not appeal to the minds of the honest men who at the moment constitute the majority of the Senate.

My hon. friend said something about Kaiserism; that the Senate is another Kaiser. My hon. friend objects to the exercise of constitutional authority sanctioned by the wisdom of the men who framed this Confederation; he protests against the exercise of that right in the interests of the people of Canada. I ask, who is the Kaiser, the Senate, acting within the authority of the constitution, or the Minister of Public Works, making a demagogic speech in this Parliament declaring against the constitution? If my hon. friend believed what he has said, then let the Prime Minister amend the resolution that he proposes to this this House, and move for the abolition of the Senate and for the establishment of authority only by this House of Commons. That will show whether or not my hon. friend believed in what he said. It is not satisfactory that he should declare that the people of the West have been robbed of their rights because the Senate did not agree to the proposal of the appointment at an improper time of an increased number of representatives. My hon. friend cannot justify that argument so long as the vacancies in the Senate, which he has a right to fill, remain unfilled. The people of the West are entitled to their rights under the constitution; they claim that and nothing more. If we get our senatorial representation at the same time as we get our parliamentary representation, we certainly shall be very well satisfied.

My hon. friend has had something to say about the honesty and fairness of the Government in regard to redistribution. Admitting, if my hon. friend likes, that the Government have been honest and fair; admitting that they have provided a fair and reasonable Redistribution Bill, is that any more than the Government ought to do? Is that any more than the people of Canada have a right to expect at the hands of the Government? Surely it is not necessary to claim that in order to get justice at the hands of the Government as to the redistribution of seats in the House of Commons, it was necessary to have an understanding as to some action that would be taken in the Senate. Surely nothing of that kind was necessary.

12 noon

I am not so sure that there is good ground for the claim that my hon. friend has made as to this redistribution measure being very fair. I think I can produce members of Parliament who are thoroughly satisfied that there was a full intention on the part of the Government majority on that Redistribution Committee to butcher their chances of election.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not believe the hon. gentleman can.

Mr. OLIVER: I think I can; I think I can find one right here now who will stand up and give my hon. friend the information.

Mr. ROGERS: Bring him up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the hon. member is departing from the question before the House.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to trespass, but my hon. friend did lay some stress on the question of redistribution, and I thought it was only fair to follow him. However, I do not wish to dwell on that point. I say it is a most unheard of proceeding that a minister of the Crown should stand in his place in Parliament, and, on the strength of the facts laid before us, give the reasons which he has given to-day for throwing this country into the turmoil of a general election while a world war is in progress. I assert that the reasons which he gave will not be accepted by the loyal people of Canada.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents and the people of Prince Edward Island, I wish to thank the right hon. gentleman for this modicum of justice which is conceded to Prince Edward Island by the passing of the second part of this resolution. Of course it applies to other provinces, but the one to which it particularly applies at the present time is the province of Prince Edward Island. We have for 40 years attempted to have the terms of Confederation carried into effect, that is the terms of Confederation as we thought and believed them to be, and as we believe to-day should have been carried into effect in 1873 and then enacted into law in the Confederation terms. We have placed before this House on many oc-

casions the contention of the people of Prince Edward Island. We claimed that the terms of Confederation were that we should be represented in this Parliament by six members. Resolutions were introduced in this House on many occasions with reference to that matter. In 1907 the first resolution was introduced in terms with the one contained in the paper now in your hand. The right hon. leader of the Opposition was then leader of the Government and he coolly turned down the proposition. He would concede nothing to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is rather departing from the usual rule followed in this House. The question before the House is concurrence in the amendment made by the Senate, and to that so far as I can see, the line of argument of the hon. gentleman has very little relation.

Mr. McLEAN: The Senate passed a resolution or an address to His Majesty, in which it is stated that the number of members for this House shall not in any province be less than the number in the Senate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The only question before the House is concurrence in the amendment. I imagine that the hon. member has it in his mind that the original resolution, with this amendment, is equally before the House and equally open to debate. But the rules of the House do not permit that; they require that members shall speak only to the amendment, the last motion put to the House.

Mr. McLEAN: I was just following the course that was taken by other hon. gentlemen. Of course, if they were wrong I am wrong, and I must give way. As you, Mr. Speaker, will not allow discussion on anything except the question which is now before the House, I shall simply repeat that although the second part of this resolution or address is now being put into law we in Prince Edward Island will not give up the fight to have the representation which we consider we should have had since 1873.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, there was an old established principle of Liberalism, one I often heard referred to in my boyhood days by those engaged in fighting the battles against the Family Compact and the battles for responsible Government in the different provinces of Canada, that the Government of a country should be according to the well-understood wishes of its people as expressed through their elected representatives in Parliament. I am afraid the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has no respect for that principle of Liberalism as enunciated in the past. Judging from his remarks to the House this morning, the hon. gentleman's idea is that government should be according to the well-understood wishes of the leader of the Liberal party in this House, as expressed by the partisan majority in the Senate of Canada. My hon. friend has said that the hon. the Minister of Public Works, if he has any complaint at all, has a complaint against the Fathers of Confederation who provided and recommended the constitution which this country now enjoys. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members of this House, if they think it possible that the fathers of Confederation, in the wildest flights of their imagination, could ever have believed that the time would come when the Senate of the Dominion of Canada, instead of being an independent body, a body viewing legislation only from the public standpoint, would become more partisan than the House of Commons itself. Because I think the assertion can be made safely and without fear of successful contradiction that the Senate of Canada as it exists to-day is a more partisan body than the House of Commons. We have found during the last few years the Senate turning down measures that have been approved by this Chamber, and turning them down because they believed they saw some advantage to the Conservative party if those measures became law. We had an illustration of their course in their amending a Bill passed by this House authorizing the taking over of the branch lines of the Intercolonial, passed after amendments usggested by hon. gentlemen opposite had been inserted in it, thus, in effect, killing the Bill. They refused to endorse the unanimous feeling of this House, because they believed the passage of that Bill would be to the advantage of the Conservative party in this country. We have the fact that they defeated a Bill designed for the purpose of improving the highways of this country, and one reason for doing so and no doubt the underlying one was given from the public platform in the province of New Brunswick by a member of the Senate, who said they did not want to pass the Bill as it would prove of great advantage to the Conservative party. So I think my hon. friend, in stating that the Minister of Public Works should find fault with the fathers of Confederation and not with the

Senate as it is constituted to-day, must have lost sight of the fact that the fathers of Confederation believed that the Senate would be an independent body, composed of a superior class of men, men of a judicial cast of mind, giving fair consideration and judgment to questions brought before it, irrespective of political considerations, and would not degenerate into a body which paid more attention to party politics and was more partisan in its action than the House of Commons. Every one, I think, knows that the majority in the Senate to-day are influenced solely by partisan considerations; and there has been no more striking illustration of this fact than the example that we have before the House and the country to-day of their refusing to give to the western provinces of Canada that representation in the Senate to which they are clearly entitled under the Constitution, and which, Mr. Speaker, with all respect to the statement made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, I say they are entitled to at the present time. There is nothing in the Constitution requiring them to wait until after a general election has taken place. Under these circumstances, I contend that the Minister of Public Works is absolutely within his rights, and not only within his rights but within the facts, in calling attention to the partisan conduct of the Upper Chamber as it is now constituted.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I think, has done the other branch of this Parliament a grave injustice by charging them with being influenced by partisan motives. I think that before my hon. friend makes a charge of so serious a character as that in reference to what ought to be, what I believe is, an independent branch of this Parliament, he ought to give some evidence of partisanship. What is the evidence which my hon. friend gives? He says that they ignored the voice of this House with regard to a Bill to enable the Government to acquire branch lines of the Intercolonial railway. Surely my hon. friend is aware that the Senate have treated the legislation introduced by this Government into a Parliament where the Conservatives are in a majority in the House of Commons far more leniently than they treated the Bill which was passed when the Liberal Government was in power. My hon. friend will recall that the Senate amended in a very drastic manner the Bill which was passed by this House in 1910. That amendment provided that before any branch lines should be taken over, there should be full and complete reports from the Board of Management of the Intercolonial and from the Chief Engineer, and that before the Government should be permitted to enter upon the operation of any branch lines it must ask Parliament for ratification of the terms of any agreement of purchase, or even of any agreement of lease. How much more drastic was that treatment of a Bill passed under a Liberal Government than the treatment which the Senate gave to the Branch Lines Bill at the sesion of 1912-13? Surely my hon. friend will remember that Branch Lines Bill when first introduced by the Government at the session of 1912-13 was very broad in character, giving the Governor in Council power to acquire lines of railway anywhere in Canada, whether connected with the Intercolonial or not. The Bill was amended in this House, and when it reached the Senate all that they did was to provide that any contract for lease or purchase of any branch line should first be submitted to Parliament for ratification. That was all; and I think it was a very reasonable provision to put in. I myself was desirous that the Bill should pass, and therefore supported it, because from the standpoint of the province of New Brunswick I felt deeply interested in the acquisition of branch lines; but I felt that for the Government to provide that it could acquire branch lines without the contract being submitted to Parliament for ratification was an extreme step to take. This House by a majority declined to accept the Senate's amendment. At the present session the Government came forward with two resolutions authorizing contracts for the lease and purchase of two branch lines of railway, in which they adopted the very principle that had been laid down by the Senate two years ago, namely, that the agreement should be submitted to Parliament for ratification. This Government made an agreement with these two railway companies and submitted the measure to Parliament, thus recognizing that the very thing the Senate had suggested was not an unreasonable thing to do.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: What else could they do?

Mr. PUGSLEY: What else would they think of doing? No one can find fault with the Government for having acted in this way. The principle has worked out in a

very satisfactory manner. The Government did not ask for authority first; they made an arrangement which was binding on the railway companies, and then came to Parliament to have the contracts ratified. And that is all that the Senate asked the Government to do in 1913.

Take their action this year. On the suggestion of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that portion of the Bill which gives general authority to acquire branch lines, was amended to provide that the purchase price should not be paid until there was a vote of Parliament. That was recognizing the authority of Parliament to deal with the disposition of the moneys of the country. That Bill passed this House unanimously, and when it went to the Senate was concurred in unanimously, so I think that so far as branch lines legislation is concerned there is no evidence of partisanship.

My hon. friend says that they also threw out the highways measure. They did nothing of the kind. They improved the Bill by providing that the money which was to be given by this Government in aid of highways should be divided among the different provinces in the same way that the British North America Act provides that subsidies shall be apportioned, namely, according to population as determined by the last census. I think that if we were to make an argument on the question, the most reasonable men in this country would say that that was a proper provision to make, because under the terms of the British North America Act all federal aids to the provinces in the way of subsidies, of which this highways measure was necessarily one, must be divided according to the population of the various provinces. I can see no evidence of partisanship in that, but my hon. friend says that a senator stated in New Brunswick that, if the Bill passed it would be a great aid to the Conservative party. I venture to say that my hon. friend has incorrectly summarized the statement which that senator made; I do not think he has given the meaning of what the senator said; and I am inclined to think that if he got a copy of that gentleman's speech he would find that the senator expressed the view that if the Bill had become law in the form in which it passed this House, it might be made a vast engine of corruption in the interests of the Conservative party. I have heard of senators making that statement, and I have no doubt that if the senator referred to made any reference of the kind at all, it was along those lines. If the Minister of Railways could spend the money wherever he pleased, without any regard to population or the requirements of the different provinces, my hon. friend can see that the Act might be made a great engine of corruption in the interests of the Conservative party; and if my hon. friend would search in his own heart he might feel that that was perhaps one of the strong reasons which induced him as a member of the Government to agree with the measure in that form, for he must have realized what an engine for improper influence it might be.

My hon. friend has given no other evidence of partisanship; but he says the Senate is a partisan body. Was it a very partisan body when the question of the Farmers' Bank came up? That Bill passed this House, and when it went to the Senate Liberal senators and Conservative senators, if there are any such—perhaps I should say senators appointed by the Liberal Government, and senators appointed by the Conservative Government—joined in defeating the Bill which they thought involved a most dangerous principle.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: I think the hon. gentleman is not speaking to the question. I was ruled out of order a few moments ago, and I would like a ruling from the Chair whether the hon. gentleman has any right to digress from the subject before the House, as he is doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the point is not well taken.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It has been stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works that the amendment made by the Senate is contrary to some understanding which was arrived at during the session of 1913-14. I have heard that statement made before, and I have seen it in newspapers; but I think that some evidence ought to be given that any agreement was made, or else hon. gentlemen ought to cease to refer to it, and newspapers to talk about it. I put this forward as a reason why this amendment should be concurred in. I think I can show that the Senate has done the only proper thing which could be done in the interests of democracy in this country. When this matter came before the House in the session of 1913-14, in the presence of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, and after he had spoken in favour of the resolution, I rose in my place and urged that the Act should only come

into effect upon the dissolution of this Parliament. I urged that in the presence of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and in the presence of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. If there had been any understanding that the resolution was to go through the Senate just as it was presented to this House, was it not the duty of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to rise and refer to that understanding? Neither by myself, nor, I venture to say by any member on this side of the House, was there any knowledge of any such understanding expressed or implied. There was the opportunity; why did not my right hon. friend get up and say to me that it was not quite fair, not quite in order, that I should urge such an amendment to the resolution because there was an understanding in connection with the Representation Bill that the resolution should go through Parliament in the way in which it had been presented to this House? I have never heard of any such understanding, and I believe that no other member on this side of the House has ever heard of it either.

The argument which I made then, the argument which I make to-day in favour of the amendment that is made by the Senate, is that in this Parliament the people of this country, the democracy, is represented. This House is the mouthpiece of the people. Whom does the Senate represent? Does the Senate represent the people, the democracy? No, Sir, the Senate represents the Crown. The senators are the appointees of the Crown. This is the popular branch of Parliament, the senators represent the Crown and they are appointed upon the advice of the Government. They are independent of the people. They hold their positions for life, and no one has the right to question their votes, because they are not responsible to any one or to any body, but are simply responsible to their own consciences for the manner in which they discharge their duties.

It occurred to me that as, by reason of the increase in the population, there ought to be an increase in the representation of the democracy in this House, and an increase in the appointees of the Crown in the other branch of Parliament, it was only reasonable and proper that the increase in the number of the appointees of the Crown should take place concurrently with the increase in the number of those who represent the democracy in this House. That seemed to me to be a reasonable proposition, and so far from the action of the Senate being against the democracy, against the views of the people having expression in Parliament, it seems to me that their action is in favour of a fuller expression of that opinion, because they say that the appointees of the Crown, and therefore the authority of the Crown, shall not be extended until the authority of the people in this branch of Parliament is extended and that both shall take place concurrently.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: How does the hon. gentleman reconcile his observations with the remarks of his leader last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not remember what the remarks of my leader were.

Mr. BENNETT: That shows a very great oversight on the part of the hon. gentleman.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I made no remarks then.

Mr. BENNETT: I think I remember the remarks of my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I made none.

Mr. PUGSLEY: At all events, it is the view which presents itself to me, and this is the reason which will actuate me in concurring in the amendment made by the Senate. The hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) has rather intimated that he would like to have an election to take the view of the people on this question as to when an increase in the Senate should take place. With my hon. friend the war counts for nothing. With my hon. friend the tragedy which is affecting this whole Empire, and no part of the Empire to a greater extent than Canada, counts for nothing compared with having his nominees appointed to the Senate at as early a date as possible. My hon. friend thinks it would be right to throw the people of the country into the turmoil of an election contest simply because he will be delayed a few months in having his friends appointed to what he hopes to be the vacant positions in the Senate. As has been pointed out, there is apparently no immediate need for an increase in the Senate because the Government has allowed many months to pass since vacancies have occurred without taking steps to fill them, and there are now some nine vacancies in the other branch of Parliament. Yesterday the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) was not able to say as to when there would be a dissolution. Has the Government changed its mind in the night so that it is possible to-day for the

hon. gentleman, who in some quarters, even by many of the friends of the Government, is called the master of the Administration, to announce a different decision? Is it possible that the hon. Minister of Public Works has induced the Government to change its views in the night, and that the intimation which he gives to-day is made with the authority of his colleagues?

Whatever the Government may do they will not terrorize any of us who sit upon this side of the House. In this, as in all other matters, we shall endeavour to do our plain duty as we see it and in respect of this resolution, I, for one, believe that the Senate has taken the proper, constitutional and reasonable course, and that the amendment which it has made ought to commend itself to the members of this House, as I am sure it will commend itself to the good judgment of the people of this country.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: Mr. Speaker, if I am not out of order, I would like to reply to a remark made by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) in regard to the late redistribution. He has intimated that it was fair and satisfactory to every one.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: More than fair.

Mr. THOMSON: I say it was not fair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that question can properly be discussed on this motion.

Mr. THOMSON: I am replying to some remarks made by the Minister of Public Works.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The statement was made by the Minister of Public Works that it was fair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The statement may have been made, but I do not think that it involves the right to go into an analysis of another Bill while dealing with the question before the House.

Mr. THOMSON: If you rule, Mr. Speaker, that I am not in order, I will accept your ruling.

Mr. KYTE: In view of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I am also debarred from participating in this feature of the debate, but I do not wish the statement of the Minister of Public Works to pass unchallenged that there have been no complaints in respect to the Redistribution Bill passed at the last session of Parliament.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. R. B. BENNETT (Calgary): Mr. Speaker, I submit there is a principle involved in the discussion of the question of concurrence in the amendment of the Senate to which attention should be directed. This Commons House of Parliament came into existence in September, 1911, shortly after which this Government was formed. There is no doubt but that the hon. gentlemen opposite always contended that the election of this Commons House of Parliament was an election that did not properly represent the will of the people. They have never believed they were defeated. They have always assumed that they were still in power, and in the desperation and bitterness of their disappointment they have sought measures and means to give effect to those views and that opinion. It is common knowledge throughout Canada, and it has been indicated by statements and speeches not of a public character, by members of the other branch of this Parliament, that this Government would never be permitted to give effect to its large measures of policy affecting the well-being of Canada until there had been another election.

That is commonplace knowledge, and the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and his followers have relied upon the will of the members of another branch of this Parliament to give expression to those views. They have endeavoured to destroy and to minimize the efforts of this Government to place in concrete form upon the Statute books of this country its policy as enunciated and declared before the elections of 1911. I am not going to travel the ground covered by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), but illustrations multiply. From the very first day this Government assumed office, from the time it began to give effect to its promises to the electors, from the moment it introduced into this Parliament a Bill providing for a Tariff Commission up to the time it carried through this House its most important legislation making for the strengthening of the naval defences of the Empire, hon. gentlemen opposite, with the aid of another branch of Parliament, made it their boast that they would not permit this Government to give effect to its policies until after there had been another election. I have stated it publicly and I repeat it in this House, that such action on the part of the Liberal party and of its majority in the Senate is a standing insult to democracy. These gentlemen opposite talk

about democracy, and they thwart its will whenever it pleases them; they rely upon an irresponsible body in another chamber to restrict and restrain democracy. We on this side of the House have not attacked publicly or privately the Senate of Canada because it is part of our constitutional fabric and our system of Government; we made no such promises as hon. gentlemen opposite made while in opposition as to what they would do to the Senate when they came to power. They talked about reforming the Senate and they were content to reform it by sending to it gentlemen whom the member for Edmonton has assumed to be more honest than the members of Parliament.

Mr. OLIVER: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman referred in the House this morning to honest members of the Senate as distinguished from the members who sit on this side of the House, to whom he referred to as being actuated by corrupt motives in introducing legislation.

Mr. OLIVER: I never used such language; I never used language that could be construed to convey any such idea.

Mr. BENNETT: I am bound by the denial of the hon. gentleman, but the words he used were "honest members in the Senate."

Mr. OLIVER: I beg to repeat that I believe the members of the Senate are honest men.

Mr. BENNETT: And the language that he used just before that was that the members on this side of the House were influenced by corrupt motives and desires in endeavouring to pass certain legislation. If there is any one man in this House who should not make observations such as that it is the hon. gentleman from Edmonton, and that is all I have to say about that—so far as I am concerned.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. gentleman is making an insinuation now, and I would like him to put it in plain words.

Mr. BENNETT: I am making a direct statement, as shown by Hansard. The hon. gentleman will surely understand what that means.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the hon. gentleman repeat his direct statement?

Mr. BENNETT: The direct statement is, that if there is any member in this House who should not make statements such as those he has made, it is the hon. member for Edmonton. That is my statement exactly.

Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, is that a fair comment on anything I have said?

Mr. HENDERSON: I think you had better take it.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to say that my memory is that I did not use such language as the hon. member has stated I did use in regard to members on the other side of the House.

Mr. BENNETT: I am bound by the observations of the hon. gentleman, and I hope he will now withdraw his statement.

Mr. OLIVER: I am willing to do so under proper circumstances, but what I deny is that I used these words during the remarks which I made here to-day. If my hon. friend asks me what my opinion is in regard to himself or in regard to members on the other side of the House, I am quite ready to give it, but that has nothing to do with the discussion.

Mr. BENNETT: I have heard the opinion of the hon. gentleman on many occasions, but it is not a matter of very great importance. I hope I may be able to exchange opinions with him during the next few weeks, or the next year or two, in a manner that will not be disconcerting to me, however interesting it may be to him.

I say that the instances multiply as to what the disposition of the Senate is towards the legislative enactments of this Government, and the records of the Senate show it. I rose as a representative of a western constituency to say that so far as I am concerned I agree with the statement made by the right hon. leader of the Government when he reluctantly asked this House to concur in this amendment. It is insulting to this House in the sense that the Senate asks us to subordinate the will of the Commons branch of this Parliament to the arbitrary will of a non-representative and irresponsible body. That I can say with safety and assurance, and about that there can be no doubt. But the feature that I desire to protest against is that this Government has not been permitted, by the deliberate, by the considered, and by the well-advised conduct of the Senate, to give effect to that legislative programme which

it had designed and which it should have been permitted to carry out. My country has suffered by the conduct of the Senate; western Canada has suffered by the action of this irresponsible body, and whenever farmers endeavour to carry grain from their farms to the railway stations in order that they may not pay ten or fifteen cents to haul a bushel of grain to the market, they will think, and they will properly think of the action of that irresponsible body which thwarted the will of democracy, as expressed by this House of Commons.

I protest against the destruction of the legislation for a Tariff Commission, a Highways Act, a Naval Aid Act, and all those Acts that represented the well-considered legislative programme of this Government. The people of western Canada protest against it, because they have been deprived of proper representation in the Senate. And, because we protest against it this Government must reluctantly be compelled to acquiesce in the amendments now proposed. The language used last year in a message from this House to the Senate fairly indicated that there was a unanimous opinion on the part of this House of Commons against the action of the Senate, and that unanimous opinion of the Commons should not lightly have been set aside by the Senate. But, of course, it is in furtherance of that scheme and plan that was formed and framed at the very moment that this Government came into existence—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Order. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is using language in reference to another branch of this Parliament which is contrary to the rules. He said that the action of the Senate in respect to legislation has been to pursue a scheme which was devised when this Government came into power. That is insulting to the other branch of Parliament and is contrary to the rules.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend has entirely misunderstood my observation. I did not say the scheme was planned or framed in any branch of this Parliament; I said that in furtherance of a well-defined scheme or plan that the will of this Government, as expressed by the majority of members in this House of Commons, was thwarted and destroyed and rendered nugatory by the action of an irresponsible and partisan majority in the Senate. That is what I said and that is all I have to say.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is contrary to the well-understood rule of this House, and the hon. gentleman should withdraw the language he has used in regard to the other branch of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think, as the phrase was given to the House, that it is exactly within the rule which would compel me to ask the hon. member to refrain from making reflections upon the other branch of this Parliament, but I do think that it ought to be a well-understood principle that it is not in good taste to reflect on the other branch of this Legislature.

Mr. BENNETT: I entirely concur in your decision, Mr. Speaker. I do not desire to reflect on the other branch of this Parliament; I merely desired to make certain observations as to its conduct and to let the public make the reflection.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): One is at a loss, when we are considering in this Parliament a question as to whether the constitution of this country should be amended, to understand why all this violence should be exhibited by hon. gentlemen opposite, because another branch of this Parliament undertook to express a view as to the wisdom and the methods by which that change in the constitution should be carried out. We must remember that the proposition contained in this resolution is a proposition to amend the constitution of Canada.

If there is any subject upon which both Houses of Parliament have the most perfect and absolute right to express their views and to exercise their judgment, it is upon a question of that character. My hon. friend (Mr. R. B. Bennett) has made a general attack upon the Senate because he alleges that it has entered into a conspiracy for the purpose of setting aside all Government measures. He or any other hon. gentleman opposite who speaks of the lack of wisdom, as they call it, on the part of the Senate with regard to Government measures, is really saying that the Senate should be a body existing solely and wholly for the purpose of registering the decrees of the Government of the day. Hon. gentlemen opposite declare that there should be a second chamber because, although they have been in power for four years, we have had no suggestion from any one of them requesting that an address be presented to the Imperial Parliament asking that the constitution of the Senate should be amended, or asking that it should be abolished, or anything of that kind. Therefore, we are bound to assume that hon. gen-

tlemen opposite accept the constitution of the Senate as laid down by the British North America Act and the various amending Acts. If the second chamber constituted in 1867 is to exercise any part in the functions of Government, it is not open to hon. gentlemen who do not dispute its right to exist to say that it should be condemned because it chooses to differ from the Government of the day. The rights of the second chamber under the British constitution are well recognized; every book on parliamentary government has laid down its rights as to the measures with which it may or may not deal, and in regard to the various measures on which the Senate may choose to take certain views and to submit certain amendments, and no hon. gentleman opposite, whose knowledge of constitutional law is of any value whatever, will dare to say that the Senate does not exercise the functions which Parliament and the constitution intended it to have the right to exercise when it was constituted in 1867. If that is so, why do hon. gentlemen speak of Kaiserism? Why does my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works fan himself into a fury because, as he says, the Second Chamber of this Parliament, which has as much right to exist and to express its views within the four corners of the charter which constitutes it as we have, has chosen to express its own opinion, in regard more particularly to this matter under review. This House did not try to pass any legislation; it initiated a resolution which had within it two purposes: First, that the constitution of the Senate should be amended by the creation of a new area in the West which is entitled to senatorial representation, and, secondly, that the representation of the province of Prince Edward Island in this House should be increased. This latter part of the resolution involved an amendment of the British North America Act, because it changed the interpretation placed upon that Act by the Privy Council and interfered with the arrangement which the Privy Council declared was the original intention of the Act. That it should have been in any way associated with the other provision regarding senatorial representation was quite out of place; but the right hon. gentleman leading the House chose to make in the draft of the resolution which he submitted to Parliament this provision in regard to amending the representation in the Senate. When that resolution went to the Senate, was there any matter upon which the Senate would have more right to express an opinion than on a matter in regard to itself? Supposing the right hon. gentleman had asked that the constitution of the Senate be changed by lessening its number to fifty instead of by increasing it as he proposed to do; would he expect that the Senate would refrain from expressing its views as to whether or not its usefulness would be interfered with by that reduction? But because hon. gentlemen opposite have got into power, much to their own surprise, and because they want to impose their will upon the people of Canada in regard to the constitutional rights which were given to this Second Chamber, they affect the attitude taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, who does not like to have his will interfered with, who does not brook opposition with any good spirit, and who, if he finds that the constitution stands between him and the gratifying of his wishes, says: Let us smash this constitution to pieces, if necessary.

Mr. ROGERS: When did I say that?

Mr. MACDONALD: That is a metaphorical concentration of my hon. friend's speech. I was giving the intent which existed in the hon. gentleman's mind when he spoke.

Mr. HENDERSON: He did not say that.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend had better apologize.

Mr. MACDONALD: For what?

Mr. ROGERS: For making a statement that is not correct.

Mr. MACDONALD: For making the statement that, when my hon. friend does not find an opportunity of gratifying his will on account of constitutional impediments, he makes the statement that the Senate is a bad body and ought to be condemned by the people of this country?

Mr. ROGERS: There is no constitutional difficulty except in the mind of the Senate.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are the senators so many automatons who jump at the hon. gentleman's will, who act when he pulls the string? My hon. friend says there are no constitutional impediments except in the mind of the Senate, even though it is acting under its constitutional rights.

Mr. ROGERS: It is not doing so.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does my hon. friend say that, when the proposition before

Parliament is whether or not the constitution of Canada should be amended in any degree, I care not how slight, the other portion of this Parliament has no right to express its opinion?

Mr. ROGERS: No, but this matter was one of agreement.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend has spoken about matters of agreement. We do not know anything about agreements, and who on the part of the Senate made any agreement or bargain in regard to the question? I would like my hon. friend to tell us. It is unwise, imprudent and entirely undignified for hon. gentlemen occupying the position which the members of the Government occupy to say that another portion of this Parliament has no right whatever to express its views with regard to legislation which the Government proposes. Do hon. gentlemen fancy that when they propose legislation to this House and it goes to the other chamber, the eighty men sitting there, appointed under the great seal of the Dominion of Canada, are to say nothing in regard to it? Have they no right to amend it or to offer any opinion in regard to it, no matter how important it may be?

My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) spoke of the importance of the legislation that was to be amended. By just so much as legislation is important, by just so much it becomes the duty of the Senate to consider carefully that legislation; and unless the other portion of this Parliament is to abdicate its functions entirely and declare that it has no right whatever in any way to interfere with legislation proposed by this Government, no matter what it may be, then the argument of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is simply an appeal of a rather demagogic character and entirely baseless, so far as any rights under our constitution are concerned. That the Senate has a right to express its views on this proposition no one can deny, as a matter of constitutional practice and law, and my right hon. friend, to-day accepting the conclusion which the Senate came to last year, that the representation of the Second Chamber should be changed at the same time as the representation of this Chamber should be changed, is simply accepting a proposition that will commend itself to any one who looks at this constitutional question from a reasonable and practical standpoint.

At one o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If no other hon. gentleman desires to address the House, I should like to say a few words. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition seems to have some doubt as to the propriety of the Senate's action in proposing an amendment to the resolution by which the powers conferred upon this Parliament by the British North America Act, 1886, will be preserved beyond question. It had not really come to my attention—at all events, it had escaped my attention at the moment—that that amendment had been made. I am, however, entirely prepared to accept it, and I do not think that there is any ground for apprehension. The powers conferred by the British North America Act, 1886, are conferred not upon the Government of the day, but upon Parliament, and no provision can be made for the representation of the Territories in Parliament except by the authority of Parliament. More than that it would seem to be undesirable that all provision for representation of the Territories in Parliament should be removed from the British North America Act. At present the only territory represented in Parliament is the Yukon, but later we may find in the northern and western part of Canada which is not yet placed within the limits of any province, a considerable population which, before the erection of such territory into a province, may very properly be represented in both branches of this Parliament. I think that such representation may safely be confided to this Parliament, for the reason that the Imperial Parliament would undoubtedly act upon a resolution of both branches of the legislature for the purpose of giving representation to such territories. The preservation of the powers contained in the British North America Act, 1886, merely means that instead of taking a roundabout way of giving representation to those territories in Parliament, we adopt a direct and more expeditious method.

I do not desire to dwell upon some matters which have been dealt with in connection with this resolution, but I do find it a little difficult to understand why hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, particularly the right hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. John city, should take ground at the present time which is absolutely the reverse of that to which they committed themselves at the last session of Parliament. In order to make

myself perfectly clear, I will read the resolution to which they unanimously assented when proposed by myself. It is as follows:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that the amendment made by the Senate in the proposed joint address to His Most Excellent Majesty the King be not concurred in, for the following reasons:

1. Because appointments to the Senate have no necessary or appropriate relation to the date of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons.

2. Because in respect of certain of the western provinces the proposed increase of representation in the Senate has relation solely to the result of the last decennial census, which result has been ascertained.

3. Because the said amendment is inappropriate and incongruous.

4. Because no sufficient reason can be adduced for the delay effected by the said amendment.

The Senate's amendment of last year was rejected on these grounds by the unanimous voice of this House; yet we have the spectacle of my hon. friends on the other side of the House now declaring that the reasons put forward last year by the unanimous consent of this House for rejecting the amendment of the Senate were absolutely fallacious and unsound. It would be well, perhaps, if they had acquainted us with the time at which and the reasons for which they came to a conclusion so absolutely inconsistent with their record of last year. Up to the present time, we have had no information on that point.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House hath agreed to their Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, respectfully requesting that His Royal Highness will be pleased to transmit the joint address to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, most humbly praying that he may graciously be pleased to give his consent to submitting a measure to the Parliament of the United Kingdom to amend certain provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, by filling up the blank therein with the word "Commons."

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There can be no opposition to this motion; it is simply a necessary corollary of the motion which has just been adopted. It gives me, however, an opportunity of explaining the attitude, since it has been challenged, that I and other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have taken on this matter.

I may remind the House that last year, when the right hon. gentleman introduced a Bill to increase the representation of the Senate, I suggested to him that the only way to do that was to adopt an Address to the Imperial Parliament asking for an amendment to the constitution. My right hon. friend, seeing that the opinion that I expressed was well founded, brought down a resolution accordingly. To this resolution I gave my entire assent. The resolution went through this House as an expression of the unanimous opinion of both sides of the House that the amendment sought to the constitution should be granted. The Senate, for reasons of their own—reasons in which I believe there was an element of soundness—saw fit to provide that this amendment of the constitution should not come into force until such time as the increased representation in the House of Commons was effected. In other words, they so amended the Bill as to provide that the voice of the people and the voice of the Crown in the matter of representation in the Canadian Parliament should be heard at the same time. I will not discuss at this time whether that was judicious or not judicious, sound or unsound; at all events, it will be agreed that even if we dissented from the view taken by the Senate, it was one of those differences of opinion which involved a matter not of principle, but simply of expediency. The opinion of the Senate was rejected by this House, and the same view has been taken to-day by the Government. My right hon. friend, who finds fault because this year I do not assent, has himself accepted the opinion of the Senate on this occasion. He says that we must make concessions, he recognizes that the voice of the Senate must be heard, and he thinks that for the sake of the good which is to be accomplished, he should sacrifice his opinion. For the common good I also sacrifice some of my own opinion. But, after all, if we are to have a double legislature, if we are to have two chambers, is it to be apprehended for a single moment that the upper chamber is simply to be the recording clerk for the House of Commons? Is it to be said that it is to have no opinion of its own? It is needless to put the question. The question answers itself. My only desire is to repel the slanderous imputation which has been made against the Senate that, because it so happens that at present the majority of the members of the Senate are in sympathy with me, they have acted from partisan motives. What partisan motive could there be when they amended not only the opinion of my right hon. friend but my own opinion also? My hon. friend has stated that the resolutions of

this House had been passed unanimously. They were passed unanimously, I admit; but the Senate, who have been stated more than once to be the slaves of the leader of the Opposition, did not consent to pass the views of the leader of the Opposition, but modified the advice both of the leader of the Government and that of the leader of the Opposition. Could the Senate have given a greater, a nobler, a more manifest example of their independence, not of one party merely, but of both parties? In the face of this record I think the insinuations that have been made against the Senate are absolutely without foundation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend says he will not vouchsafe any opinion as to the action of the Senate last year or this year. But I was a little surprised last year, within a few weeks after the Senate had taken this action, to find my right hon. friend giving reasons which in his judgment made that action of the Senate perfectly sound, although in the House of Commons about ten days before he had committed himself in the most distinct terms to the proposition that the action of the Senate was absolutely unsound and improper.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In what way?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will read it to my right hon. friend again. He said on the 12th day of June by his vote in this House—

Mr. PUGSLEY: There was no vote.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There was no vote?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is a new constitutional doctrine. I had understood that members of this House who sit silent and assent to the passing of a motion unanimously are as much committed to it as if they had voted for it; and I had also understood that they had, in effect and in every substantial way, voted for it. That has been my understanding up to the present moment of enlightenment by hon. gentlemen opposite. The right hon. gentleman by his vote said that:

> Appointments to the Senate have no necessary or appropriate relation to the date of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons.

He said that:

> The said amendment is inappropriate and incongruous.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

He said that:

> No sufficient reason can be adduced for the delay effected by the said amendment.

That was on the 12th day of June. A few days afterwards on the 19th day of June, my right hon. friend said, in a published statement which I presume emanated from him:

> The law makes it compulsory to have redistribution after every census but it does not say it should go into effect at once. In 1892 a Redistribution Bill was passed but the increase did not go into effect until the general election of 1896. It is the same in this case, the increase in the representation of the Commons does not go into effect until the next general election, and the increase in the Senate should not go into effect until then either. "I leave it to any one to say whether my position is a correct one or not," said Sir Wilfrid smiling.

I suppose the smile was induced by the fact that only a week before he had said precisely the opposite to what he said in this interview. So in the circumstances I do not think my right hon friend has yet made it very plain to this House or to the country why it was that he committed himself distinctly to one line of action on the 12th day of June and a week afterwards, on the 19th day of June, stated that the reasons which he had so endorsed by his action in this House were absolutely fallacious and unfounded.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do I understand my right hon. friend to mean that, whenever a proposition is mooted in this House, whether in the form of a Bill or otherwise, voting for it implies assent to every line of it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have always understood that when any hon. gentleman dissented from a motion of this House he either called for a vote or asked that it should be recorded as "carried on division".

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes, and on this very day my right hon. friend has moved a motion in which he himself does not believe.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg the right hon. gentleman's pardon, I have done nothing of the kind. I said that owing to the tyrannical and unjust action of the Senate it was necessary for us to adopt this course. And I would like to say this one thing more: the right hon. gentleman has said that the Senate ought not to degenerate into being a recording clerk of the House of Commons.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is just one thing worse than that—to have the Senate degenerate into being a recording clerk of the minority in the House of Commons.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Senate did not, because in this matter there is no minority.

Motion agreed to.

SOLDIERS' VOTING BILL.

The House again in committee, Mr. Blain in the Chair, on Bill No. 111, to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise.—Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice).

On section 1—soldiers entitled to vote:

Mr. DOHERTY: I think that the principal suggestion made looking to the amendment of this section was that we should omit from the requirements of qualification the requirement that the soldier shall be 21 years of age. Quite a number of gentlemen said that this appeared to them to be an unnecessary requirement, and that once a man was of the age where he was competent to take an active part in military operations, more particularly in fighting operations, he might very well be considered to have attained a sufficiently mature age to be allowed to vote. No doubt a very great deal is to be said in support of that view. On the other hand, assuming us to abandon the requirement of a man's being of age, unless it were possible to fix some other specific age, the result might be that very young boys would be qualified to vote. That creates a situation which makes it necessary for us to fix some age limit, and once a limit has to be fixed it seems to us best to adhere to that limit of age which in the view of the law with regard to matters generally, constitutes the age at which one may look for maturity. In consequence, I have reached the conclusion, in which I think my colleagues agree, that the section should in that respect stand as it was originally introduced. There are, however, some verbal modifications that require to be made in order to make the section more clear, and to avoid the use of at least one unnecessary expression. In order to make more clear the description of the period required in order to qualify the soldier to be entitled to vote, I propose to provide that the designation shall be "a period of thirty days anterior to the date of appointment or to enlistment in the forces." I propose to strike out the word "enrolled" in the expression "appointed to or enlisted or enrolled in such forces," and also where it occurs further down in the section. I further propose to modify the wording of the section in view of a consideration that I am not quite sure was pointed out, but which occurred to myself at all events, and that is that under the section as originally introduced, the fact of residence in any electoral district in Canada prior to enlistment being made a qualification might result in a man being qualified to vote who had resided thirty days in Canada twenty years ago. The affidavit which was made part of the section would, however, have corrected the section in so far as the objection I have suggested is concerned, because it required that the person claiming qualification should swear he had resided in Canada for thirty days immediately preceding his enrolment. But when I came to look into that, I found that if the affidavit removed the one objection it might create this situation, which I think one hon. gentleman has already pointed out, namely, the possible existence of the situation where a man who had lived thirty days or more in some particular district might have gone to some other district for the purpose of enlisting and been delayed there for a few days, so that he could not say that he had resided in either the one or the other district for the thirty days immediately preceding. I thefore propose to offer an amendment the effect whereof will be that a man who has resided in any electoral district for a period of thirty days within the six months preceding his enlistment shall be entitled to vote in that electoral district, and, inasmuch as it is possible that a man might reside in two separate electoral districts for a period of thirty days within that six months, that it shall be the electoral district in which he last resided for a period of thirty days. Perhaps the best way of making these amendments, which do not alter the substance but are made only to make the provision more clear, would be to substitute for the clauses introduced the corrected clause, and I therefore beg to move that section 1 of the Bill be struck out and replaced by the following:

1. Every male British subject of twenty-one years of age or upwards serving in the military forces of Canada in the present war (hereinafter called "volunteer"), who, within six months immediately preceding the date

when he was appointed to or enlisted in such forces, had been resident in any electoral district in Canada for a period of not less than thirty days, shall be entitled to vote in the electoral district in which he was last so resident in the manner hereinafter set out, notwithstanding his absence from such electoral district or from Canada. - Provided that if any person was, at the time he was so appointed or enlisted, qualified to vote in any other electoral district in Canada he shall vote in such other district only.

That leaves the clause precisely as it was except for the modifications which I have pointed out.

Mr. OLIVER: In regard to the age limit, there is no doubt that theoretically the view taken by the minister and shared in by his colleagues is correct, namely, that under ordinary circumstances it is not advisable to vary from the rule as to the age limit being one qualification. But I submit that we are dealing with an extraordinary situation, and that it is only right that we should consider the difficulties that surround it. If the fact of enlistment is the qualification, then there is no question that every man who has enlisted is a qualified voter and may exercise his right as a voter. But if we have an age limit of 21 years, under the peculiar circumstances under which it is proposed the vote shall be taken, there is room for difficulty, which I do not wish to emphasize or enlarge upon, in establishing the right of any voter to vote if he is about the age of 21 years. The ballots are in the hands of the officer. The officer is in control of the men. He has his political predilections, and possibly is aware of the political predilections of his men, or of some of them. If there is an age limit, there is a question for argument as to whether he is over 21 or under 21, and in an argument between the officer and the man, I need not point out to my hon. friend, who has himself seen service, to my personal knowledge, and with all credit to himself, that the man is not in a position to argue the point with his officer. For that reason I would be favourable to basing absolutely the right to vote on the fact of enlistment or appointment, although I am not in theory favourable to a lowering of the standard. In the peculiar circumstances I would take the liberty of placing that view before the committee.

Mr. DOHERTY: When we come to a subsequent section the hon. gentleman will see that the argument he anticipates is to be settled by the affidavit of the man. The man is to get a ballot when he makes the affidavit, so that he will settle the argument himself.

Mr. OLIVER: So long as it is absolutely settled I am satisfied.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the minister in a position to tell me what is the youngest age at which these volunteers are accepted? Is there an age limit fixed by the department?

Mr. DOHERTY: I cannot say absolutely that there is an age limit fixed by the department, although I think that ordinary soldiers enlisting are accepted at 18 or 19 years of age, but there are buglers, drummers and boys acting in different capacities.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are there any scouts?

Mr. DOHERTY: There are no boy scouts that I am aware of.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think there are.

Mr. DOHERTY: There may be; I only say that there are none that I am aware of. But there are quite young boys in the position of doing military service, in regard to whom I think the general consensus of opinion would be that they would hardly be of an age at which they could be expected to exercise a mature judgment. Unless for very strong reasons to the contrary, it seemed to those who were responsible for the introduction of the Bill that we must have some degree of maturity, and although it may perhaps be a little beyond what is absolutely required, we thought it the safer course to adhere to the age fixed in the law generally as being the age limit.

Mr. MARCIL: Eighteen is the age fixed in the Militia Act for enlistment; I am speaking of the volunteer and not of buglers, drummers or boy scouts. In this case you may have a large number who have enlisted, but who, not having taken the oath as to age, would not become voters. An injustice is being done to the boy of 18, 19 or 20 years, who has enlisted, and who undergoes all the hardships and risks of war, if he is cast aside. I think he will feel that injustice very much, because he knows that he can get the Victoria Cross, the highest distinction for valour, no matter what age he is. I am in favour of the principle of giving the soldier a vote if he is a voter. I am also in favour of giving him a vote if he is not a voter, because the service he is rendering to his country entitles him to that consideration, but I am opposed to this Bill, because I do not think it guarantees that the ballot

which the soldier casts will be the ballot which we will receive here. A very great injustice is being done to the boys of over 18 years of age by depriving them of their votes. The minister knows the old verse:

> Mais aux âmes bien nées,
> La valeur n'attend pas le nombre des années.

Boys of 18, 19 and 20, who have the spirit to enlist for the defence of their country, ought to be trusted to cast an intelligent vote. Napoleon Bonaparte was a general in chief of the army at 25. A young man of 18 should be given this right.

Mr. DOHERTY: The boy under 21 years who, being a soldier, is not given the right that is given to a soldier who is over 21, suffers exactly the same injustice as the boy in civilian life of 19 or 20 suffers as compared with the man over 21 who may be in precisely similar circumstances of merit or demerit and who has his vote while the boy under the age of 21 has no vote. It is not only in military careers that I think we have had cases of early maturity in civil life, one very prominent case being that of a gentleman who became Prime Minister of Great Britain at the age of 21. If the reason of the hon. member is right as regards military circles it ought to be equally right when applied to civilian circles. If it be a good argument that, because we find exceptional cases of maturity developed beyond what one's years would apparently lead one to look for, we should make a general rule departing from the age of 21 years, it would be as applicable to civil life as to military life. I am sorry to hear the expression used that any injustice is intended because after all from the voting point of view all that is to be said is that the boy of 18 does not gain something as compared with the soldier of 21 which he would not have gained had he not been a soldier as compared with any other man in the ordinary walks of life and 21 years of age. Perhaps we have not given, but we have not taken away.

Mr. MARCIL: My sole reason for saying that we should give these boys the right to vote is because they have enlisted. That is the main reason for the wrong, if wrong there be. I do not see why a boy who is capable of bearing arms and serving his country at the age of 18 or 19 years should be debarred from exercising the franchise. The issues of the election may be more fully comprehended by the young man than the man of maturity. I am sorry that the minister has not extended common justice to those in the ranks above 18 years of age.

Mr. GERMAN: Would the minister state whether or not, in his opinion, this measure would apply to medical doctors who are not serving in the active militia force, but who are in hospitals? I know of two doctors from the town of Welland and one from Niagara Falls who have gone over. One is an active militiaman and he probably will be at the front though serving in a medical capacity. The other two are serving in their medical capacity, but are not, I believe, members of the militia force. Would this Bill, in the minister's opinion, allow these gentlemen to vote?

Mr. DOHERTY: In my judgment the wording is sufficiently broad to cover such persons. This Bill does not deal with the militia at all; it deals with the military force of Canada and gives a vote to everybody who is serving in it without distinction as between the classes of service that are being given. I understand the Bill to cover the gentlemen that the hon. gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Bill as introduced apparently provides that it shall apply to any by-election which may take place after the Act comes into force. Does the minister understand it in that way?

Mr. DOHERTY: As the Bill was introduced there is no restriction, but it will be made clear that the whole Bill is intended to apply only to a general election.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Bill provides for two classes of voters, the first class being those who have now no vote in Canada but who are enfranchised because they are in the military forces and are twenty-one years of age and British subjects; the second class comprising those who already have votes in some province of Canada. When the soldier is confronted with the affidavit, he is asked to swear that he is qualified, and to my mind that appears to be a legal question which it would be difficult for the soldier to answer. In Nova Scotia, a man cannot vote unless his name is on the list. The lists are made once a year and completed on the 5th of April, so that the list completed the other day will prevail in Nova Scotia in any election which takes place until the 5th of April next year. Therefore, a man might be qualified to vote and still not be on the list. Unless there is a list in the possession of the officer, and the soldier can see if he is on

that list, he would not be able to say on oath whether he is qualified or not. I would suggest that instead of the word "qualified" the word "entitled" should be used, as the soldier might be in a better position to say that he was entitled to a vote. The word "qualified" implies a legal question, which the soldier should not be asked to swear to.

Mr. DOHERTY: In the affidavits provided under the Dominion Elections Act, there is a similar requirement, and I think it has been generally understood as calling upon the man to swear merely from the point of view of the fact. It has to be supposed that a man would not swear he is qualified unless he had knowledge which fully justified him in saying he was. If he has any doubt about his qualification in the other respect, he will have a qualification in virtue of the thirty days' residence. The purpose of requiring a distinction in the affidavit is really as far as possible to secure that men who are qualified in a particular district shall vote there, and to avoid a possible consequence of depleting some one or more electoral districts, and perhaps overloading the electoral districts in which the men have been just before they enlisted. I see no particular objection to substituting the word "entitled," as suggested by my hon. friend, for the word "qualified," but it seems to me it will amount to practically the same thing. A man who swears that he is entitled to something has to determine a question of legal right on his part, just as much as if he has to swear he is qualified. Both expressions are open to the objection that analysing them strictly they imply not only a statement of fact but of judgment by the person making the statement of fact, that that fact, by law, qualifies him or entitles him to a certain thing. I think there is no great risk involved in using in these affidavits with regard to our soldiers the words which are used in other affidavits with regard to people generally. I think experience goes to show that those who are called upon to take oaths of this kind realize that what they are swearing to is as to the existence of a particular fact upon which, as they understand it, their qualification rests.

Mr. OLIVER: While I am quite willing to accept the explanation of the minister with regard to the age limit, I am not willing to accept the reasons he gave. The Minister of Justice has said that because a young man in civilian life is not entitled to a vote until he becomes twenty-one years of age, therefore he should not be entitled to a vote in soldier life until he reaches that age. That is entirely contrary to the spirit on which the Bill is founded, which is, that the young man who is serving his country is entitled to special consideration in regard to the exercise of his franchise. That being so, the young man who by reason of his being of an age sufficient to give the full service to his country that he would if he were twenty-one years or over, is surely entitled to the same advantage of franchise as if he were twenty-one years or older. The civilian qualification is based upon certain well set out conditions, the young civilian on attaining the age of twenty-one being liable to certain legal conditions. There is a change in his status between 20 and 22, which makes the difference between the civilian voter and the civilian non-voter by reason of age; but there is no such difference in status between the boy of eighteen and the young man of twenty-two in regard to his military service. I merely wish to draw attention to this fact; I am not wishing to make legislation for the Government or for the minister; but while I am willing to let the matter go as he has explained it, I do not wish to be understood as agreeing to the reasons he gave.

In regard to the residence qualification, I took exception to this proviso when the Bill came to the House first; and, after all has been said, I still maintain that this proviso is unnecessarily confusing in the proper exercise of the right of the voter. It is quite true that if the voter has a right to vote in a certain district, he can cast his vote in that district; but when you come to make a distinction between the man who has a right to vote in a district and the man who has not a right to vote in a district, you practically give an opportunity of switching ballots, which is something that is not desirable, I am sure, from the point of view of the minister. We must do the best we can under the circumstances we have to meet; and my contention is that we shall have a law that will give to the soldier the right to cast his ballot if we strike out this proviso, and by striking it out we shall be much more certain that the ballot will be cast in one case as it is in the other; that is, that there will be a similarity of treatment and action of the soldiers in the direction of where their ballots will go. I do not wish to introduce

personal matters into this discussion, but let me do it merely in order to illustrate my point. There are in training now in Edmonton and its immediate vicinity two regiments of infantry and a squadron of cavalry, the men having been recruited from the country surrounding Edmonton. Owing to the delay in enlistments for the second and third contingents many of these men were residents of either East Edmonton or West Edmonton for thirty days before they enlisted.

I am speaking now of the constituency of West Edmonton, for which I have received the Liberal nomination. The soldiers may have had the right to vote in other districts, or they may not have had that right; but when their votes come to be cast, there is a very great possibility in one constituency of the votes being massed to be cast in that constituency, and in the other constituency of the votes being distributed over the localities from which the men came. This is not a sound principle; it is neither necessary nor right. As I have said, I do not wish to make this matter personal; but the candidate nominated by the Conservative party in the constituency of West Edmonton is the senior colonel of the two regiments to which I have referred, so that the matter is entirely under his control. I do not wish to make any suggestion against this gentleman, that he is likely to take particular advantage of his situation but I am saying that that is the situation, and not only do I think I am doing what is right when I bring the concrete facts before the House, but I think the minister will be wise to consider the situation in the light of the facts I have stated to him. The political conditions in this Bill go pretty close home to the city of Edmonton, and that is why I am venturing to take up the time of the House and the minister in discussing this Bill.

4 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not sure whether I have understood the hon. member sufficiently clearly to reply to him, but I do not see how the ambiguity arises that he fears. A man on the list who has a right to vote in any constituency has no option thereafter. He is bound to exercise that right.

Mr. MARCIL: There are no lists in Alberta.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are no lists now. Lists, of course, are to be made up. Do I understand the hon. gentleman's remarks to apply to certain districts in which there is the right to swear in on election day?

Mr. OLIVER: In those provinces where there are no standard lists, there is no way of checking beforehand the status of the voter; it is all a matter of enumeration immediately before the election, and therefore there is not the same possibility of verifying any condition in regard to any voter, on the part of himself or on the part of any one else, that there is in other parts of the country. Apart from that, the condition is the same in all parts of the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I understand the hon. gentleman aright, he says that the right in Alberta and Saskatchewan of a man to swear in if his name is absent from the list, taken in conjunction with this Bill, leaves that voter, if he is a volunteer, in a position practically to elect where his vote shall go.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is more able to deal with such details than I am; but it appears that in so far as this Bill may not provide certainty it is incidental to the system of list-making in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

What I arose chiefly to do was to put before the committee my own view as to the question raised by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and repeated by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), as to the extension of the franchise to all soldiers although they may not have reached their majority. I take the view that the Bill in that respect is right. I do not look on the extension of the franchise to the soldiers as in any way a quid pro quo, as in any way a benignant action on the part of the state to him in virtue of his soldiership. It appears to me that in regard to the British franchise the law presumes, that if the individual man has a real patriotic interest in his country's affairs, and secondly, if he is competent to express that interest, that man is entitled to vote. We take certain precautions to ascertain whether he lives up to these two requirements—whether he has a real patriotic interest in his country's affairs and whether he is competent to express that interest. We say that he must be a resident, that he must live so long in a certain locality. If he is a rolling stone, we cannot presume that he has that fixed and determined interest that he otherwise will have. On the other hand, in order to ascertain whether he is competent to express his vote or not, we fix the age of twenty-one as the age of maturity at

which he arrives at competency. Then we say that a judge by virtue of the restraints of his office is incompetent to express his interest. Then we come here and make an extension of the franchise in one respect; that is, we do not insist upon the condition of fixed residence. To that extent and no more, there is in this Bill an extension of the franchise.

Why do we make that extension? Have we a right to presume that real interest in the affairs of this country which ordinarily is considered proved by fixity of residence? I think we have. The very fact of his enlistment, even though being a British subject he comes from the United States, and has not fulfilled the requirement of three months' residence in the locality or a year's residence in the province, gives us the right to presume that he has a patriotic interest in the affairs of Canada. Consequently, we do away with the old requirement.

But the hon. member for Bonaventure says we ought to do more; that we ought to presume that he is competent to express his interest even though under age because he has enlisted.

Mr. MARCIL: Provided he is at least 18 years of age.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Provided he is 18. I do not see that the fact that he enlists should in any way convince Parliament that he has reached a higher degree of mental maturity than other men. His enlistment undoubtedly is an expression of a loyal interest in the affairs of the country, but it is an expression of loyal interest only; it is not proof that he has a greater mental development than his fellows. I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition is wrong when he says that we should bann this measure because it extends the franchise. It extends the franchise only in a direction where we have a right to presume the requirement fulfilled which otherwise we demand of the voter, namely, an interest in his country's affairs. I think the hon. member for Bonaventure is wrong when he complains not that we are extending the franchise, but that we are not extending it far enough, because the direction in which he wishes it extended is a direction as to which no presumption by virtue of enlistment arises at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Never since 1897 have we undertaken to define the franchise. That has been left entirely to the provinces, and in view of the fact that you are extending the franchise to those who go to fight, you are not in a position to answer the contention of the hon. member for Bonaventure. The Government are determined that they will not alter the qualification of voters with respect to age. But what I rose particularly to deal with is a statement which I have just heard on the the part of my hon. friend, namely, that lists will be made. This is the first intimation we have received that lists are to be made in connection with the voting of the soldiers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that; I do not know what sentence my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. MARCIL: I had said that there were no lists in Alberta.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understood that the hon. gentleman said that lists are to be made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Lists must be made in Alberta and Saskatchewan under the present Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There are no lists in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But they are made by enumerators prior to the election.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Exactly. If no lists are to be sent to the front, matters will be further complicated, and that is why I want to inquire as to whether or not lists are to be made. If the lists made in Alberta and Saskatchewan are not to be sent to the front, how will the soldier be able to establish that he is qualified to vote? This only goes to show how many difficulties there are in this proposed legislation. Parliament has decided in favour of the Bill; therefore I shall not press any objection as to the principle of it; but my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has invited suggestions, and I may tell him that I am prepared to offer an amendment. The great objection to this Bill is that it puts aside altogether the safeguards which we have considered to be necessary in connection with elections in this country. If we have an election—and the hon. Minister of Public Works this morning, during the course of his speech, gave us due warning that we are going to have an election—every vote that is cast in Canada will be surrounded with all the safeguards that it is possible to provide. Yesterday I was struck with the speech of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett), who told us that

notwithstanding all the precautions with which the law has endeavoured to surround the sacred rights of the franchise, fraud after fraud has been committed. At election time, party spirit runs very high. I stated the other day—and I do not believe that any hon. gentleman will question my statement—that during the course of an election offences are committed against the law, actuated by party spirit, which would not be committed by a man in connection with his private affairs. Am I wrong in this? Is any one prepared to say that I am not right? It is the experience of every man in this committee that during elections the law has been violated by most respectable citizens, who did for their party what they would not have done for themselves. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that the men who go to the front and who are ready to shed their blood for their country will not do anything wrong in this respect. I have the greatest possible confidence in the men who have gone to the front; but, after all, they are but flesh and blood, and are subject to the same temptations to which other men are subjected. Every day, in the prayer which is said in this House, we say, "Lead us not into temptation;" yet it is proposed to put temptation in the way of these men, and to trust that everything will be done correctly. I ask fairly and with all sincerity, is that business? Is that proper legislation? Should not at least more precautions be taken in order to ensure that this method of voting shall be carried out with some degree of honesty and faithfulness? I have a good many friends at the front; hon. gentlemen opposite also have many friends at the front. I have great confidence in them, but I am not prepared to say that there shall not be some delinquency; I have yet to learn of any human activity in connection with which, at some time or upon some occasion, there has not been delinquency. All I ask is that more precautions be provided in connection with this proposed legislation. If it is not possible to take some of the precautions adopted in connection with elections at home, give us some precautions which will ensure that the franchise shall be exercised with the same degree of fidelity and faithfulness as we expect it to be exercised in connection with the voting in this country. As the Bill is now drafted my hon. friend cannot tell me who will be the officers who will take the oath and do the recording.

Mr. DOHERTY: I concede that under the Bill as drafted I could not tell that. I have made more precise the disposition to deal with that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Very good; he has made the language more precise. Has the amendment been printed?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, it has not been possible to have the amendment printed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend has probably made an amendment to his draft to say that either the colonel, or the major, or the captain, or the lieutenant is to take the vote. But whoever takes the votes takes them without any check upon him. Would my hon. friend the Minister of Justice think of having the votes which are going to be recorded in Canada by the returning officers cast without any check upon the returning officers, without administering any oath to them and without having any scrutineers over them, with no protection to assure that the vote of the electors would be properly recorded? He would not think of doing so. If it were attempted every one would say it was an outrage. No Government has ever done it. Now, the limit of my hon. friend's amendment to the present draft is that he will delegate somebody in the army to take the vote. Since the vote has to be taken as a vote for the Government or for the Opposition, a disposition which I do not like but to which we have to submit, will my hon. friend agree to a commission of two, appointed by the Government to represent both the Government and the Opposition, to go to the front and take the vote? Then these commissioners will check one another and will ensure that the vote is honestly taken. That is not an extraordinary precaution. The vote in Canada we can deal with later; we are most concerned with the vote to be taken in Europe, because there are more of our soldiers there. I suggest to my hon. friend that he would singularly improve this Bill if he were to provide that the vote shall be taken by two commissioners appointed under it to represent both the Government and the Opposition, and to ensure, after all, some degree of absolute faithfulness in the discharge of these duties.

Mr. DOHERTY: Before I answer the suggestion I would like to say one word with reference to some observations of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). I do not propose to repeat anything I have said with regard to the age qualification But the hon. gentleman expressed what I might call his apprehension that in the par-

ticular case in which he is especially interested the colonel might be an undesirable element, from his point of view, if he had any control of these votes. The proposal I intend to make with regard to the method of the ballot reaching the soldiers and the vote being taken would pass quite by the colonel, leave him quite on the outside, so that in that especial respect my hon. friend has nothing to fear. What we propose to suggest is to utilize the machinery whereby these men are paid and have these ballots given to them through the paymasters. The paymasters are not combatant officers. I have ascertained from the Paymaster General here that there exists a system by which these ballots could pass to the paymaster in England, and from there the assistant paymasters and the regimental paymasters would bring them to each smaller unit, that is the squadron or the company or the battery. They bring the men their money, and surely they could bring the ballots to them. These ballots would in that way reach the officers commanding the companies or squadrons or batteries, according to the nature of the force. With regard to the suggestion the right hon. gentleman has made, of course I would not do otherwise than consider any suggestion the right hon. gentleman would make. The first objection to the suggestion that occurs to me at the moment is that I doubt its practicability. We have to remember that we have to reach a large number of men, 30,000 or 40,000 or 50,000, scattered over a considerable territory; and for any two men to gather all the votes of these men, I am afraid would take a very long period of time, longer I may say than the interval that would elapse—

Mr. MARCIL: Ordinarily there is 30 days between the issue of the writ and the voting.

Mr. DOHERTY: Let us take 30 days. We have to bear in mind that these ballots have to get from London to the men, and that after the vote has been taken they have to get back here to Canada again, and I would be afraid it would not be practicable to have that looked after by two men. If the idea could be put into practice it would be necessary that we should have a number of couples of men who could divide the work between them. That might work out in a more practical way. If they are to go two, whose report is to prevail? Supposing they go two, and as they started out in disagreement I suppose that we have some reason to expect that they would return in disagreement, whose report would be final? I do not know whether it is intended simply that they should bring back the ballots or that they should make a report. I would have great fear that we would not get any agreement between the members of such a commission.

Mr. MACDONALD: What would they differ about?

Mr. DOHERTY: I did not just grasp what it is they are to report.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They would put the certificate on the envelope and send it to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. DOHERTY: Might I suggest that we should consider this when we come to the section dealing with the method in which the votes are to be taken?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes. I threw it out in advance so that we might take it up when we reached that section.

Mr. GRAHAM: Reverting to section 1, this is a matter on which each has his own personal view. A good deal of our difficulty would have been obviated as to the qualification, if the Government or the committee had adopted the principle that the going to the front of the soldier should not deprive him of any right which he had before he went. That would leave the qualification the same, and would get rid of a great deal of difference of opinion as to what that qualification ought to be; and it would not open up the question of an enlargement of the franchise. I am strongly of the opinion that 21 is the proper age. I admit that if you change the age to something else, you can keep on changing it by the same argument. I h ve not heard any good reason advanced why we should change from the age limit that we have always had. After mature deliberation it has been decided in this country that a man has not reached the proper years of maturity at which he is able to vote until he is 21. I do not think the fact of his going to the front changes the principle at all, for a man of 21 years of age is the same at the front as he is at home, loyal and brave and patriotic though he may be. I think we should get rid of a lot of the difficulty if we took the ground, which several speakers on the Government side of the House as well as speakers on this side have taken, that the men who have gone to fight for their country should

not be deprived of the rights of citizenship which they had before they went.

Mr. DOHERTY: I recognize that there is force in that. But this consideration was impressed upon the minds of the committee: that a large number of men who, when they left home, were not qualified voters would, if they had stayed at home, have been in a position to complete what was required to enable them to get a vote. For instance, I understand that in the large cities of Ontario at all events, there is, after the election has been called, a registration which brings in a large number of people, and they get their votes. Now every soldier who would have been in a position to avail himself of that opportunity is deprived of it because he is away; and this applies not only to Ontario, but to the western provinces, where enumerators are appointed to make out lists after an election has been called. Now there will be many soldiers who if they had stayed at home would have been enumerated and got their votes—that is those who had the proper qualifications—and even if they were not enumerated they could get their votes simply by walking in to the poll and swearing to their qualifications. I think it is generally recognized as being true that we have a large proportion of recruits from those western provinces, and that the cities in the East have contributed at all events a highly creditable proportion; and if we are correct in our assumption that many of these would have got their votes but for their absence on military affairs, we reduce to a comparatively small number those who would not have got the vote if they had been at home, and are now getting it because of being soldiers. For myself, I am glad to see them get votes, but if there be objection with regard to that, there is this to be said in support of it. The hon. gentleman says that it would simplify things to let only those vote who were qualified to vote; but it seems to me that if you are willing to take in the man whose absence of qualifications results solely from his absence from the country, it is not worth while, in view of the presumably small number left, to create the necessity of distinguishing betweeen your soldiers. In this Bill we get a distinction as between those who are over and those who are under 21, but we are adhering to the view that a man is a man when he is 21. We certainly should not be able to find out who were the men who, not having qualified at the time they enlisted, could have got themselves registered if they had been at home; and if we said that only those should vote who are now qualified we should be excluding not only those who if they had been at home would not have got a vote, but also a large number of those who if they had been at home could have got a vote. The simplification of the thing was one consideration that weighed with us, and we came to the conclusion that not only the proper way but the simplest way was to give every soldier a vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I wish to make clear that I am in favour of giving every man a vote who would have had the right to a vote had he remained at home. I meant to cover that class of men.

Mr. DOHERTY: We could not ascertain that.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: This Bill is to give soldiers who are away from home an opportunity to vote if an election takes place during the war. That election may or may not take place during the war, and I should like to ask the minister whether he has ever considered the advisability of looking after the suffrage of the soldier after he returns from the war. A great many of these soldiers will not be on the voters' lists when they return. They will not be entitled to vote as soldiers, and I think a great many of them will be disfranchised. I think that we should be just as solicitous in looking after the suffrage of the soldier after he returns from the war as when he is at the war.

Mr. DOHERTY: I may say that the question that was referred to the committee was: What could we do in the way of giving votes to soldiers who were out of the country or away from home? and I have to admit that we did not get beyond the question that was referred to us; and perhaps some things that have been seen and heard would indicate that we did not need to look for further difficulties, but that quite a few presented themselves within the bounds of the question referred to us. I quite recognize that the situation that my hon. friend has spoken of is one that will call for action, if that is possible, before we are confronted with it, but I am afraid I can hardly undertake to deal with it just now.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that there need be no apprehension so far as Ontario is concerned. Looking over the statutes I

find that I was wrong. The statute has been amended since my time, so that those absent on militia service can be retained on the list. If I could show that my son or brother was absent on militia service, his name would be retained on the list.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: What if he was not on the list?

Mr. GRAHAM: That would not make any difference; he could be put on the list.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: He has to appear in court and prove that he is 21 years of age and a British subject.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not under the law of Ontario. If he is absent on militia duty, or through his duties as a fisherman or lumberman, his father can put him on the list. That covers the unmarried man. As to the married man, his residence does not change so long as his family continues to live at the same place; so he would be kept on the list, or if he was not on the list he could be put on. I think the point raised by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Hugh Clark) is covered by the Ontario statutes at the present time. I did not think that was the case the other night when I spoke.

Mr. NESBITT: I understand there have been some amendments to clause 1. Will you, Mr. Chairman, please read them?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is proposed to substitute a redraft for section 1. We strike out the words "or enrolled" in fixing the period of time for residence anterior to date of enlistment or enrolment. It was pointed out that the word "enrolled" added nothing to the word "enlisted." The second change is intended to make clear that the thirty days' residence in a place required to give qualification under this section must be within the last six months preceding the enlistment. In view of the possibility that a man might have resided in more than one place for a period of thirty days within the last six months preceding his enlistment, it is provided that the place in which he shall be qualified shall be the place at which he last resided for thirty days during that last day six months.

Mr. NESBITT: Suppose he only resided two or three days where he was enlisted?

Mr. DOHERTY: If he only resided two or three days where he was enlisted he will not get a vote from there but, if there is any other place within an electoral district in Canada in which he has, within six months previous to his enlistment, had a residence for thirty days, he can qualifiy in that electoral district. Some one pointed out the other day that it might happen that a man, having lived thirty days, or perhaps a year, in a particular constituency, might, for the purpose of enlistment, go down to some other place and be there three or four days before enlisting. He could not say that for thirty days immediately preceding his enlistment he had been in the original place and as he had not been thirty days in the place where he was enlisted he could not qualify there.

Mr. CARVELL: We are not talking about residence; we are talking about a legal term. There has been many a case threshed out in the courts of Canada as to what constitutes residence. The condition in my own province is very much the same as it is in the province of Quebec. We have a list prepared once a year and when that list is closed there is no possibility of getting another name added to it. Any man who has resided in the province of New Brunswick for six months prior to the 24th day of August is entitled to have his name placed on the list in the district in which he then resides. Take a young man who has no home or take, for instance, an immigrant. He has lived, we will say, in the county of Carleton for a few weeks or months—no home, no wife, no friends; he has worked somewhere for a few weeks; he has moved from there to the county of York; perhaps he has worked in the shanty for a few weeks; he has moved from there to St. John; he has happened to be there for five weeks and he has enlisted at St. John—as I understand this provision, it would give him the right to elect that St. John would be his residence.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. CARVELL: The difficulty is that that man, under the law of New Brunswick, would not have a right at all to be on the voters' list on the score of residence, not having had a fixed residence for six months prior to the 24th of August.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Although he would not otherwise have the right, the very fact of his enlistment would justify us in giving him that right, would it not?

Mr . CARVELL: That is the whole question that we have been discussing here. I am now discussing this first clause, and I am pointing out the difficulty of knowing where this man's vote would be cast. In my opinion this only makes it easier to have

these votes distributed where they are most needed.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is quite true that we are giving the vote to a man for a thirty days' residence. We have never pretended to give the vote only to a man who would be qualified under the provincial franchise. What we have endeavoured to do is prevent him from making a choice of the place he shall give as the place of his thirty days' residence. We get at the proof of the thirty days' qualification in the same way as it would be got at under the provincial franchise, and if a man is truthful in his affidavit, we tie him down to the last place in which he has resided for thirty days.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This Government ought to do one thing or the other. They should either simply give the right to soldiers to vote at the election provided they would have the right to vote if they had been at home. That would be in accordance with the argument which has been made by gentlemen who support the Bill and who say that it would be a great hardship to deprive a man of his right to vote simply because he happens to be abroad in the service of his country. But you confer the right to vote upon soldiers who, if at home, could not have a vote and you are including a class of people to whom you give a greater right than would have been given to them if they had remained at home. I think you should either limit this right to those who, if at home, would have the right to vote or extend it to all soldiers who are engaged in the Canadian forces, no matter whether they are under 21 years or not. That is the logical position to take. The Minister of Justice admits that he is giving a new franchise to the soldiers. He is giving those the right to vote who, under the present electoral law, would not have the right to vote in many cases if they were at home. He is allowing soldiers who have not been residents of Canada at all, who may simply be temporarily in the country, who may have come from the West Indies, or the United States, or other countries, to serve under the British flag and who have found it convenient to enlist in the Canadian army, the right to vote simply on the ground that they have been in Canada for a period of thirty days. He justifies that on the ground that men who are willing to go to the front and risk their lives in defence of the country should be recognized by giving them right of citizenship. After all, the privilege of casting the ballot is the highest expression in the law of the right of citizenship. This Bill proposes to give the right of citizenship to many soldiers because they have gone to the front and risked their lives for the defence of the country. If that is the principle upon which the minister is proceeding, why not give that same right of citizenship to all who are deemed by the Government to be capable of bearing arms, worthy to be sent to the front and worthy to take their share in the defence of the Empire? The Solicitor General says that the age of 21 is looked upon as the age of maturity. How absurd it is to say that it shall be deemed the age of maturity as to the casting of a ballot, and that it shall not be deemed the age of maturity in respect to the soldier who goes into training, goes to the front and is thought to have sufficient judgment to make a good soldier. It requires good mentality for a man to become a good soldier, and the law deems a man over 18 years of age fit to be a good soldier and to fight for his country. Why not give to the young man who has lived all his life in Canada this highest right of citizenship, if you are going to give it to a soldier who has been only within our gates for a few days, and who may know nothing about the issues which divide the people, and to whom in many cases it would be a matter of supreme indifference whether he cast his vote for the Government or for the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman characterized my statement as absurd when I said that the age of maturity for the purposes of exercising all the functions of citizenship might well remain at twenty-one years, and that that was not inconsistent with permitting a citizen at eighteen years of age to enlist to take his part in the war. In thus disagreeing with me, I do not think that the hon. gentleman meets with concurrence on the part of his own associates.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I deny that in considering this Bill I have any associates except all the members of this House. I understand that this Bill is not introduced as a party measure, and I am expressing my own views irrespective of what others may think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is exactly what I am pointing out, namely, that it was the hon. gentleman's own view to disagree with me, and that in it he is not supported by those usually associated with him. I have often thought it strange that the hon. mem-

ber for St. John cannot disagree with anything without denouncing it as absurd.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think I used the word "absurd."

Mr. MEIGHEN: A reference to Hansard will be a wonderful revelation to my hon. friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think I used the word.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it is absurd to say that twenty-one years is a proper age for exercising the function of citizenship, and at the same time that eighteen is a proper age to enable a man to enlist as a soldier, then this absurdity has stood on the statute books of Canada all the time my hon. friend was minister, and all the time that his Government was in power. The Militia Act is there to say that a man may enlist at the age of eighteen.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A measure like this was never proposed before.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What has that to do with what I am discussing?

Mr. PUGSLEY: It has a great deal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman said it was absurd to recognize twenty-one years as the age of full citizenship and eighteen years as the age of a soldier, and I say that principle had been recognized, and properly recognized, by his Government for fifteen years, and further, that it has been recognized by every Government in the civilized world.

Mr. CARVELL: During these fifteen years, has the Solicitor General ever known that membership in the Canadian militia was considered sufficient to give a man the right to vote?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What has that to do with what I am discussing?

Mr. CARVELL: I would like to have an answer to my question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because the question never arose in these fifteen years; but can you describe as absurd the law of the United States, or the law of Great Britain, or the law of every civilized country, because it determines that a man may be a soldier at eighteen years but may not reach the full maturity of citizenship until he is twenty-one years? What I argue is that the fact of a man's enlistment does not raise any presumption that he is any more in a fit position to express more intelligently his views on public questions, at the age of eighteen, than is his cousin of the same age at home. It is true that at the age of eighteen there are many soldiers as there are many civilians much more fit than those who have reached the age of forty to be entrusted with the franchise. But, you cannot base on the mere fact of his enlistment the presumption that he is fit to exercise the franchise at the age of eighteen. That is all I argued, and it does seem to me sound sense. At all events, that argument had the support of the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Graham) in very explicit language. I do not find any fault if one disagrees with me, but I do not think that the enunciation of so moderate a theory can be characterized as absurd. If a man enlists at the age of eighteen, the presumption is that he takes a more vital and patriotic interest in his country's affairs than if he had stayed at home, but the presumption does not arise that he is more developed mentally and thus more fitted to exercise the franchise than a person who has attained the age of twenty-one years. It does not seem fitting that the view which I have taken, and which is expressed in the legislation of many countries, should be lightly characterized as absurd.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I regret if I used the word "absurd," and if so I apologize. What I pointed out was that it was inconsistent for the Government to say that in respect to the votes of the soldiers, they will ignore all existing law, simply because the man is a soldier, except the law as to the age limit, and, when it comes to the age limit, that they will adhere rigidly to the existing law. The Solicitor General says that after all the question of importance is as to whether a man has arrived at the age when he may be reasonably expected to take an interest in his country's affairs, and what I argued was that a man of eighteen, who was patriotic enough and intelligent enough to volunteer for overseas service, having lived in Canada from the day of his birth may reasonably be presumed to have a better knowledge of the best interests of this country, and to be better able intelligently to cast his ballot, than the man who has had no home in Canada, who has not spent any part of his life in Canada, who may have come from any part of the world, and who, being a British subject, although an entire stranger to Canada, is given a vote simply because he has resided somewhere in Canada for the short period of thirty days before he enlisted. That is my

argument, and it seems to me it is impossible for any satisfactory answer to be given to it. If the Government insists upon conferring a new citizenship upon a great many men who are soldiers, they should extend it further, and they could, with the utmost safety, extend it to all those who do go to the front, whether they happen to be twenty-one or eighteen years of age.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would my hon. friend extend the franchise to the bugler of fourteen?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Buglers do not bear arms.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are at the front.

Mr. MARCIL: I brought up the question; and, so far as I am concerned, the Solicitor General will understand that I want the vote given to all soldiers. If I have urged that the boy of eighteen should be given the right to vote, it is because he is just as well qualified as the boy of nineteen or twenty or twenty-one. Before the boy of eighteen can enlist, he is thoroughly inspected, mentally and physically; he is physically inspected from the top of his head to the bottom of his feet, and he must be found in every respect a fit subject for bearing arms and intelligent enough to comprehend and understand military movements of all kinds. If he is found physically or mentally unfit, he must stand aside, so that the young lad of eighteen who is competent to enlist is in every respect a perfect man who is doing the same duty as the man who accidentally happens to be a few months older than he is, and yet you are depriving him of the franchise simply because of an accident of birth.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is recognized that the volunteer is so inspected and that he is passed on as physically within the requirements of the law and as mentally sound; but similarly a lad of five is just as mentally sound as a lad of eighteen, and in so far as military requirements are concerned, would on that score pass the examination just as well as would the lad of eighteen. Therefore there would be just as much reason for admitting the youth of five to the franchise, provided there was some capacity in which he could serve at the front, as there would be for admitting the youth of eighteen. I do not like to be arguing against the extension of the franchise to any man who volunteers for such a great war as the one in which we are now engaged; but I do not see any reason for presuming that because a man goes to the front, he is necessarily further advanced mentally and that he has a more thorough knowledge and a more competent power of expressing his interest in his country's affairs than the man who stays at home. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) says: What right have we to presume that because some one comes from the United States and lives in some part of Canada for thirty days, he has any interest in the affairs of Canada and should be given a vote? We have a right to presume it because he has come here to fight the battle of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The battle of the Empire.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Any Britisher who has sufficient interest in the Empire—and Canada is a part of the Empire—to come here to enlist as a soldier to fight the battle of the Empire in Europe is sufficiently interested in Canada to know how to vote.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. gentleman does not give him the right to vote unless he is a British subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly not. Does the hon. gentleman argue that we should give it to those who are not British subjects?

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. gentleman has argued that himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not arguing that. Naturally a subject of His Majesty who comes here from the United States or anywhere else who wishes to serve the country to which he belongs and who is willing to expose his life in that service, demonstrates that he has sufficient interest in the affairs of this country to entitle him to vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But you will not give the vote to a youth of nineteen who has lived in Canada all his life?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not because he has not sufficient interest—I made that very clear when I spoke first; he has sufficient interest and he has demonstrated that in the most convincing way that any man could demonstrate it—but because he has not reached the age when by the laws of our country he is competent to express that interest. If we could presume that merely because he enlisted he was further advanced than he would otherwise be in his mental competence, then we would give him the right to vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the case of a civilian, the law requires a residence, we shall say, of a year. Do you not presume that a man, because he goes to the front, has a more active and deeper interest in the welfare of his country than the civilian has? You allow him to vote simply on a short term residence of thirty days.

5 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That man by going to the front demonstrates that he has that interest which is at the bottom of our franchise.

Mr. GERMAN: What more interest has he in the welfare of Canada than the man who stays at home and does his duty at home by the soldiers at the front?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now we are on another point. There may be many at home who are not doing their duty at all; but if we extended the franchise and made it universal applicable to wanderers with no local habitation, they all would also have the right to vote. We have no right to presume that merely because a man stays in Canada he has that interest in his country's affairs which is at the bottom of the franchise; but we have a right to presume that because a man goes to the war, he has that interest. I do not think I could express my own mind better if I spoke longer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nor what is in the mind of the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. OLIVER: If a citizen of the United States of America comes across the boundary line and enlists in the army of the Empire through Canada and takes the risks of war, inasmuch as he has rendered all the service to this country that he can render; that he is making the supreme sacrifice that any man can make, and that he is making it for Canada and for the Empire, why should that man not be recognized as having a reasonable and sufficient interest in Canada to allow him to vote? If any man is to be recognized as having done any special service to the country entitling him to special recognition because of his enlistment, I say: Why is not every man entitled to that same recognition?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will answer my hon. friend in this way. The fact that an American citizen comes to Canada and enlists for the war goes to show that he has some interest in Canada and the Empire. The question is: does it go far enough? The hon. member for Edmonton will agree with me that a British subject should have higher rights to citizenship in Canada than an alien, and that the fact that a man is an alien creates the presumption against him and makes the usual adverse presumption founded on non-residence here much more difficult to be overcome. The fact that a British subject resides in the United States raises the presumption against him that he has not an interest in Canada's affairs unless he overcomes that presumption by some act. If he comes here and volunteers for the front, then we say it is overcome; but if he is an alien, if he is not only a resident of the United States, but a citizen of that country, then the fact that he volunteers is not to my mind sufficient to overcome the presumption.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Take a Sikh from India or the other immigrants from India who have been coming into British Columbia. My hon. friend would propose to give them the right to cast their ballot simply because they happened to arrive thirty days before enlisting, although the young man of eighteen or nineteen or twenty, who as I said has lived all his life in Canada, knows a thousand times more about the real interests of Canada and the issues dividing the parties than a stranger could possibly know, be cause no man coming into this country and residing simply for thirty days can become seized of the issues which affect the two parties unless he has an intellect far and away beyond that of the ordinary citizen. Surely my hon. friend must see that, either we ought not to extend the franchise at all, or if we recognize that the fact that a soldier goes to the war is a reason for extending his right of citizenship, we ought to give the same right to the young man between eighteen and twenty-one who goes to the front and risks his life just the same as any other soldier does.

If we extend the franchise to those who enlist for service abroad, we should also extend it to the young men of Canada who have lived in this country all their lives, whose hearts are with Canada and who are in a position to vote more intelligently than strangers who have been in this country only for a short period of thirty days.

Mr. OLIVER: I have repeatedly given the reasons why I object to this provision, and I desire now to move to strike out the proviso of section 1.

Mr. MARCIL: Aside from the Niobe, the Rainbow and the submarines, there are other steamers and vessels belonging to the Government upon which are serving a large number of persons who are qualified to vote in the maritime constituencies of Canada. They have always found it difficult to register their votes at the time of a general election. I do not see why it should not be possible for these boats to be in the harbour of Esquimalt, Vancouver, or some other port, so that the men serving on them would not be completely debarred from casting their votes. There must be 50 boats in the naval service, the crews of which lose their votes at every election. Is no provision being made for them?

Mr. DOHERTY: The provision which the hon. member desires is not peculiar to the present situation. No doubt we may sometime devise provisions whereby absentees may vote; the experience of other countries which have adopted such legislation indicates that it is not an impossibility. So far as the naval force is concerned, the number of men serving on the different vessels who would otherwise be voters is not very large, while the soldiers are people who would have been entitled to vote if they had been at home.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is provided here that when a soldier comes to register his vote, the official who receives it must decide whether the soldier has a right to vote anywhere else. I cannot see that any machinery is provided by which that difficulty is to be settled.

Mr. DOHERTY: Precisely the machinery that is provided when that situation arises before a deputy returning officer and where the man is sworn.

Mr. OLIVER: There is this difference: when the voter comes before the deputy returning officer and is sworn, witnesses and other persons are present, the act is a public act which renders the man liable within the knowledge of those who represent either one candidate or the other. There is a restriction there, in the public interest; under this legislation there is no such restriction, and there is no possibility of there being any. My hon. friend may say: you are unjustly imputing impropriety of some kind. I say we are not imputing any more impropriety than we are when we enforce the provisions of the Elections Act. The vote counts just the same, whether it is cast under the very loose conditions provided by this Bill, or under the conditions provided by the Elections Act. We are dealing with something in which is involved the control of the affairs of Canada, and I think that when the Government comes forward with a measure that undertakes to introduce an entirely new principle and an entirely new method of procedure, we are entitled to say that we require adequate safeguards, of the same purport and effect as those cast around similar proceedings under the Elections Act. This proposed legislation absolutely fails in that regard, and in order to relieve the situation as much as possible, I want to reduce the possibility of varying the conditions unfairly or unjustly. That is why I move that this proviso be struck out. The amendment which the hon. minister has made with regard to the qualification of thirty days' residence provides that every man who is entitled to vote shall vote; it gives him the right to express his view. When you have done that, you have done what you can for the soldiers; now I ask you to do what you can for the body politic by ensuring that there shall not be any switching of ballots. This is an unpleasant subject to deal with, and I do not intend to go into the details. I have already pointed out to the hon. minister the conditions which prevail at Edmonton, Calgary and many other places, and if this provision remains in the Bill, there is an opportunity to switch the ballots where they will do the most good. My hon. friend knows that that is not desirable and proper; I assume that it is not his intention that it shall happen, but the provisions of the Bill make it entirely possible.

Mr. DOHERTY: The remedy the hon. gentleman offers seems to me to be intended to prevent the possibility of switching any ballots by providing by law to switch all the ballots. I think, looking at it from the standpoint of the interest of the body politic, that interest is that we should do everything we can do to keep these votes in the district to which they would naturally belong. The remedy the hon. gentleman suggests is to take them all, holus bolus, out of that district.

Mr. OLIVER: No.

Mr. DOHERTY: I cannot agree with him that that would be the best way to remedy the difficulty. As to the discussion about precautions, we can best deal with that when we come to the section which deals with the method of voting.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to take exception to the comparison made by the minister that instead of part of the ballots being switched all should be switched. There is no such proposal as to switch all the ballots by striking out this proviso. A large proportion of voters were resident in the districts in which they were entitled to vote for 30 days before their enlistment. While, theoretically or on the face of it, the hon. minister might be warranted in using the expression he did, as a matter of actual practice there is no sufficient warrant for his sweeping statement. I maintain that while there might be some restriction of the right of the voter to vote in the district in which he was entitled to vote originally, that would be very limited under the very desirable provision that he has made in regard to 30 days' residence. I think that the amendment which he proposes has relieved the situation so that this proviso, even from his own point of view, is not really necessary or advantageous.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister states that the difficulty I pointed out as arising from that proviso is met easily and effectively by some affidavit that can be prepared of the voter. I can find only one affidavit here dealing with that. With regard to putting safeguards around the vote, we might as well try to put safeguards around the rays of the moon and keep it from shining on the earth as to put safeguards around this poll. We have to be very careful that we do not use any strong language. The word "absurd," for instance, is prohibited and some other adjectives; but I venture to say there are no adjectives known to Worcester, Webster or Walker that would do anything like justice—

Mr. DOHERTY: I suggest that the hon. member try the Century dictionary.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is not much new in Webster, Worcester or Walker, and if it will please my hon. friend I will add the Century to Webster, Worcester and Walker.

Mr. DOHERTY: You ought to try it first.

Mr. McKENZIE: And I may say to my hon. friend and to the hon. member for Calgary who have fathered this thing, that it is a thing of beauty in itself which both of them could fall down and worship without any fear of being guilty of any idolatry, for it is not like anything in the heavens above nor on the earth beneath nor in the waters under the earth. The minister said yesterday that the affidavit was copied. Well, perhaps it was. I believe the minister when he said the Bill was not copied. I can readily understand that, because they certainly could not find anything like this to copy. It is a most serious thing for us to conceive that some 25,000 or 30,000, perhaps 50,000 men, of the most heterogeneous character of people that could be conceived of, and under the most adverse circumstances to obtain order or regularity, shall be let loose on polling day. They will be all scrambling for some position where they can poll their votes. There will be nobody there who will know them, nobody who can keep the slightest check as to who they are. As a rule, in towns and particularly rural districts, the presiding officer at the poll is well known and knows everybody in the district; and the presence of a respectable man sitting at the poll box is to some extent security for those who are interested in the election to see that the right thing is done. But here we are in the forests of northern France or somewhere with these men casting their votes before a stranger who knows nothing about them or where they should vote. One man could come in 30 times and vote if he was bad enough to do so. These men will be no better there than at home, and they would do it at home. The minister knows that there is personation by the hundred thousand in elections. If he does not, I tell him it is done. I tell him it was done in my county a year ago last February by his party, done over and over again; and now we are told upon the faith of the goodness of the people, because they crossed the Atlantic they lose all their sin and iniquities, they are washed away in the Atlantic, and these men are now so pure, honest and good that we offend the minister by suggesting that some safeguard should be thrown around this poll. He tells me there is an affidavit here that will prevent them from representing themselves as voting in one place whereas in truth they belong to another. I cannot find it. I think I should ask if there is such a proviso, and in doing so I to some extent relieve my own responsibility by giving another slight conception to the minister of my aversion to this Bill from stem to stern, and to everything about it.

Mr. DOHERTY: The observations of the hon. gentleman will come in better when we come to deal with the methods and precautions provided. I want to assure him,

for the moment, that if I had had any conception that I was providing for votes for "hydrogeneous" people, I certainly would never have introduced this legislation. When we come to deal with this matter I shall certainly see that anything that gives votes to hydrogeneous people is eliminated.

Amendment of Mr. Oliver negatived; amendment of Mr. Doherty agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 2—distribution of ballot papers:

Mr. DOHERTY: The Bill originally provided for the sending of ballots not only to the commanding officer in Bermuda and to the secretary of the High Commissioner in England, but likewise to the officers commanding the forces at military posts in Canada. It is proposed by the amendments that will come in their proper order to provide that all soldiers in Canada shall vote on the ordinary election day in the ordinary and usual way, with this exception simply, that the ballot shall be provided for them at the places where they are and that they shall be allowed to so vote outside of the electoral districts in which they are to vote. I therefore propose to amend this section by striking out all reference to commanding officers at the bases and camps in Canada, and it will then read as follows:

2. A sufficient supply of ballot papers in form A of this Act and of envelopes for holding the same with affidavits in form B printed thereon shall be sent by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the officer in command of the Canadian troops at Bermuda and to the secretary of the High Commissioner for Canada in London, England, and such papers and envelopes shall be kept by such officer in command and the secretary of the High Commissioner.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As I read the section, no date is set when it becomes the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to send out these ballots. Is it the intention that he shall send them out as soon as the Bill becomes law?

Mr. DOHERTY: It might be so. I had not in mind the necessity of fixing any particular time for doing that. The idea of this Bill is to create a situation where, if an election did come on, things would be in such shape that it would be possible for the soldiers to exercise their votes. Under the Bill it is proposed that these ballots shall be in the possession of the secretary to the High Commissioner, and of the officer at Bermuda, for use should occasion require. I would understand the Bill to mean that the ballots will be sent whether or not any one concerned contemplates an election in the near future.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is a period of five or six weeks between the issuing of the writ and polling day. It seems to me that is quite sufficient.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the thing is to be effective at all it is very important to do what can be done to make sure that the ballots get back in time. As regards Bermuda, it might be possible to send out the ballots and get them back within the five or six weeks; but it is difficult for us to calculate just how long it would take to send them across the ocean to the secretary of the High Commissioner, and then across the Channel, and into France, and so on. What we can do to reduce to a minimum the risk of those ballots not being back in time, I think we ought to do. I cannot see that any evil is likely to result from putting a certain number of blank ballots in the hands of persons designated in this section. It simply puts us that much more forward at the time of the election writ. The ballots would remain in London. Another section provides that upon communication with the secretary of the High Commissioner, the machinery for getting these ballots to the proper officers can at once be set going. It is of course uncertain how long it may take to get the ballots to the soldiers and back here again. This provision was made simply because it was thought that there were advantages in avoiding delays so far as we could, and that no harm could come from having a certain number of blank ballots entrusted to the secretary of the High Commissioner.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Should not this section be considered in connection with the suggestion which the right hon. leader of the Opposition has made, and which the minister said he would take into consideration. I doubt very much whether it will inspire public confidence to have a large number of printed ballots sent to the office of the High Commissioner, who is a member of the Government. We know how carefully ballots have always to be preserved, because one of the things which might be done by persons who took an interest in political matters, would be to have the ballots switched. There is no safeguard for keeping the marked ballot attached to the affidavit. That could be changed by a person desiring to do it. And, therefore, if there are to be commissioners, it seems to me the ballots ought to be placed in the custody of the two commissioners and kept in a place of safety.

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, these ballots have no value in themselves until they are marked. While the office of the High Commissioner is mentioned in the Bill, a modification has been made to provide that they shall go to the secretary of the High Commissioner, and shall be kept by him. We were endeavouring to select a permanent official. After all we are trusting the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to have these ballots in his possession. Is there any more danger in entrusting them to the secretary of the High Commissioner?

Mr. NESBITT: Except that he is a servant of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, I think the secretary of the High Commissioner is the servant of the people of Canada.

Mr. NESBITT: The servant of the High Commissioner.

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, the High Commissioner is the chief officer, but I do not understand that he appoints or dismisses the secretary at his will. So far, the secretary has certainly been treated as a permanent official. I suppose I am lacking in the capacity that enables one to see so far into a milestone as some people can, and to be quite as suspicious as it may be quite justifiable to be. But frankly, I am at a loss to know why it is more dangerous to have these blank ballots in the hands of the secretary to the High Commissioner than it is to have them in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery described as the secretary of Parliament as distinguished from the secretary to the High Commissioner, who is the servant of the people of Canada. But if anybody is afraid, and if I can work it out so that I shall not be depriving the soldier of his vote because of the delay in sending over these ballots until the last minute, I shall be glad to join in the distrust of the secretary. But, to be perfectly frank, I do not grasp why it is objectionable.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The reason is this. First of all, I may say that I know Mr. Griffiths, the secretary to the High Commissioner. I think he is a very honourable man, and I would not at all find fault with him. But we are not discussing the merits of this or of that individual. There is a great difference between the secretary of the High Commissioner and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who is an independent officer so far as he can be. I think that he is a servant of the House, and is dependent only on the House. The same thing is not to be said of the secretary to the High Commisioner. I repeat that I know the secretary is a perfectly honourable man who would be unable to do anything wrong. So far so good. We will come to that later. If my hon. friend thinks that the delay which I have just mentioned would be sufficient to enable the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to send the ballots over after the dissolution takes place it is not worth while discussing the point; I am quite satisfied to leave it as the Bill contemplated. I imagine that these ballots would have to be printed by the King's Printer upon special paper.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And I suppose you would have to take the ordinary precautions. I do not see there is any provision in this Bill for a special count to be made of the ballots. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has to answer for what he does and whenever he sends ballots out of his office he keeps a record of how many have been taken and the party to whom the ballots are issued has also to give an account of the number that he has received, the number that he has used and the number that he has returned. These precautions are enjoined upon those who have to do with the voting in an ordinary election and it seems to me that similar precautions ought to be required in this Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have noticed that in the New Zealand Bill they seem to have thought it necessary to take some precaution in regard to the ballots because they provide that the electoral officer shall issue ballots only to those who make application for them. This Bill provides that whether the soldier is given a vote or not the ballot is to be distributed and it may be that these ballots may get into the hands of those for whom they were not intended.

Mr. DOHERTY: While I cannot claim to have foreseen everything in the drafting of this Bill, I can claim to have learned something from some of the observations which have been made. There would be some advantage if hon. members would let us get to the sections that deal with the matters in regard to which they have apprehensions so that I could explain them and we could make some progress. Hon. gentlemen are perfectly justified in criti-

cising the Bill as it is before them and in the form in which it was presented, but if that criticism were made when we came to the sections dealing with these particular subjects, I would be able to point out that we have improved upon the Bill as originally presented by providing that the ballot shall only be handed by the officer to such volunteers as take the affidavit. I must say that in thinking the matter over myself it did strike me that a very dangerous situation might result from distributing ballots around and I therefore propose to provide an amendment that shall require that a soldier, in order to receive the ballot, must first take the affidavit.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not the minister think I ought to be forgiven when I take the Bill as we have it?

Mr. DOHERTY: I not only think you ought to be forgiven but I assure you you are forgiven.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Bill has been all torn to pieces by the minister. He comes to-day with a new Bill which has not even been typewritten, which is not printed; none of us knows what it is, we are groping in the dark, and the minister is unfolding to us this wonderful production which none of us has had an opportunity of seeing.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think there is some force in what the hon. gentleman says about the printing of the proposed amendments, which, as I understand, are very important.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, they are.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So, I think that at six o'clock we will rise and proceed with some other business.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think I perhaps owe some apology to hon. gentlemen for the fact that the Bill is not printed. I can understand that some inconvenience may be occasioned by it, but we would have avoided some of that inconvenience if there had been a greater readiness to deal with the Bill section by section. I admit that the Bill has called for a great deal of amendment. I am quite willing to admit even that some of the tearing to pieces of the Bill, which the hon. gentleman attributes to me, was contributed to by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and perhaps I ought to thank them for it. I announced at the beginning that I was willing to learn, and I am not ashamed to say that I have learned very many things. I suppose my hon. friend will not be offended if I say that I have learned some things from them, and I am trying to put these things into operation. I would have been glad if time had made it possible for the Bill to be reprinted. I did ask to have a certain number of typewritten copies.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If there were some typewritten copies it would be an assistance.

Mr. DOHERTY: I trust my hon. friends will forgive me for this.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will forgive you.

Mr. DOHERTY: In view of such kindly forgiveness, might I suggest that this second section be allowed to pass?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am sure I am satisfied.

Mr. DOHERTY: If you can find a method by which these ballots can be improved later on, we certainly will be glad to consider it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I hope the right hon. the Prime Minister will not in future say that this House unanimously agreed to the section because we allow it to be carried.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If you allow it to carry unanimously, I shall certainly not.

Mr. MARCIL: Some other inscription should be put on the ballot—something designating that it is for a Dominion general election or that it is for a soldier's vote.

Mr. GERMAN: I understand from the right hon. Prime Minister that we may rise and finish the Bill later, because clauses 3 and 4 are what I might call the iniquitous clauses of this Bill. The Minister of Justice has had two days on this Bill now, and he is only beginning to see light through it. I am afraid that before he gets through at all many days will have elapsed. I would suggest to the minister that he had better abandon it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If it is going to take so long in the future there is all the more reason for utilizing the twenty minutes before six o'clock.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are two things I mentioned yesterday that I want again to draw to the attention of the minister. I refer, first, to a member of the paymaster's staff or an officer who is himself a candidate having to do with the taking of this vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have a clause providing for that.

Mr. GRAHAM: The next matter to which I want to draw the minister's attention has reference to taking the votes of the soldiers in Canada. I want to urge upon him the necessity of providing all the safeguards that we have in an ordinary election when taking this vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think the clause I have in my mind will carry out the two suggestions which the hon. gentleman made yesterday. I propose to provide that no officer who is a candidate shall act in any capacity in carrying out this Act. Another provision in regard to the soldiers at home is that they shall vote under the same conditions as the ordinary voter votes with this exception that we will provide returning officers and polling places at the camps where the men can vote and register their votes although these votes will be applicable in other districts. In substance, the entire procedure provided for by the Dominion Elections Act is followed except in two things. For instance, the returning officer will not have to hold a nomination and he will have to take some means of ascertaining who the volunteers in the camp are who claim the right to vote, where they claim the right to vote and so forth. But in so far as the method is concerned, when it comes to the actual voting, we provide that the deputy returning officer shall proceed as in an ordinary election and on the ordinary election day. When it comes to actual voting we propose to provide a deputy returning officer who would take that vote as nearly as possible as it is taken in ordinary elections, and to take it on the ordinary election day.

Mr. McKENZIE: It will be taken on election day?

Mr. DOHERTY: Taken on election day.

Mr. GRAHAM: It has been represented to me that the censorship which is over all communications from the trenches might interfere with the secrecy of the ballot. The ballot is supposed to be absolutely secret and a man might write anything he likes upon it and some persons have represented to me that it will be liable to interfere with the strict censorship that is on everything that comes from the trenches.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is possible that if the censors thought there were any occasion to censor correspondence addressed to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery they might open the ballots, and censor them, but that is rather a remote possibility, if it be a possibility at all. Of course, if necessary, the censorship authorities might be communicated with, and I fancy they would not be adverse to letting the ballots come to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would not do to let the censors open the packages, because the secrecy of the ballot would be destroyed.

Mr. DOHERTY: If these ballots, when they arrive, indicate that they have been opened they will not be counted.

Mr. PROULX: As I understand it, there will be only one day set for taking the vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: Do you mean in Canada?

Mr. PROULX: No, in the trenches.

Mr. DOHERTY: We do not propose to take these votes on election day. The ballots will be sent to the officers who will issue them and take the affidavits and receive the votes and mail them back, but there is no provision that that should be done on one day, or as to when it should be done. If these ballots get back to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in time to be forwarded to the returning officer of the different electoral districts by polling day they will be counted; otherwise they will not.

Mr. MARCIL: The return of the candidate will not be delayed by waiting for the ballots?

Mr. DOHERTY: That is not proposed.

Mr. NESBITT: Suppose certain ballots should come to the returning officer in a riding, and the returning officer and the candidates and everybody knows that the votes sent there do not lawfully belong to that electoral district, and the proofs are positive as to that, what would happen?

Mr. DOHERTY: The remedies in that case would be just the same for the soldier vote as they are with regard to the votes polled at any election which are polled as a consequence of a false oath. I have no doubt that, under such circumstances, upon a protest, the votes would be struck out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But if that offence were committed in this country, the man could be prosecuted for perjury?

Mr. DOHERTY: To be perfectly frank, I do not contend that we could convict a man in this country for having committed perjury in France or Belgium.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And therefore you provide a penalty that you cannot enforce.

Mr. DOHERTY: The penalties may not reach everybody, but they are provided for offences, which I think the right hon. gentleman will find are quite susceptible of being committed in Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And out of Canada.

Mr. DOHERTY: And out of Canada. The law will reach anybody within the limits of Canada, so that the penalties provided are not wholly nugatory. I do not think we would be justified in leaving out these penalties because they do not extend so far as we would like them to.

Mr. OLIVER: If an offence in connection with this Act should be committed by a soldier in Canada, could the legal punishment be applied to him?

Mr. DOHERTY: I know of no reason why the punishment is not susceptible of being applied to a soldier. There may be conditions prevailing in this country which might justify the military authorities resisting any attempt of the civil power to proceed against a soldier, but as an abstract proposition, when a man becomes a soldier he becomes bound by the military law, but he does not cease to be bound by the civil law.

Mr. OLIVER: As far as an abstract proposition is concerned, of course the minister is right, but as a concrete proposition I am afraid he is not right; that is to say, as my hon. friend is aware, it would be a matter of very serious difficulty to undertake to enforce the law against a soldier on active service in Canada who by the terms of this special legislation is given the right to vote, and who contravenes the ordinary law of the land.

Mr. DOHERTY: I may be ignorant on the subject, but I am not aware of that. I do not think that in any conditions that we can foresee at the present time in Canada, if a soldier violates the criminal law of the country, he will not be amenable to the civil tribunal. I have had occasion comparatively recently to look into the question with regard to certain things that have occurred; and so far as my opinion may be valuable, I would say that taking conditions as they stand to-day in Canada, the soldier who would be guilty of a criminal offence would be liable to be tried before our ordinary criminal courts and dealt with accordingly. I may point to the instance of the militiamen who, for an act performed ostensibly in the course of their military duties—I refer to the recent unfortunate shooting accident at Fort Erie—were brought before the criminal courts, and although it is true the jury found no bill, all that means is that the civil tribunal decided that there was no cause of action; but the fact that they were brought before those courts—and there has been no suggestion made that they were not amenable to those courts—shows that in the judgment of those courts there was no question as to their responsibility before a civil tribunal. In connection with another unfortunate instance of the same kind which occurred in Montreal, I had occasion to look as carefully as I am capable of looking into the question, and I certainly reached the conclusion that in that instance, if it had been possible to reach the man concerned, he would have been liable to be prosecuted before the criminal courts of the country.

Mr. McKENZIE: The principle of the law which the minister has laid down is well recognized, that is, that a soldier can be tried before our civil courts; but the the case which the hon. minister mentioned is a case where the crime was committed within Canadian territory. I do not suppose the minister says that if a soldier committed a crime beyond Canada, the criminal courts would take hold of him after he came back to Canada.

Mr. DOHERTY: I said to the right hon. leader of the Opposition that we do not pretend to say we could prosecute a soldier or any other man in Canada for a crime committed outside of Canada.

Mr. OLIVER: There is a jurisdiction of the military authorities in civil matters to some degree. I am not altogether wrong in making that suggestion.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not say that there is no military jurisdiction, but a man may find himself subject to both military and civil jurisdiction. We might also have conditions in this country which would justify the military authorities in refusing to allow interference on behalf of the civil court. I hope we shall not have those conditions, and I see no reason to indicate that we shall have them in this country. I do not wish to be too dogmatic in any sense upon this subject; all that I would like to say is that the fact that a man becoming a soldier may become subject

to military law and therefore perhaps liable for an act which he has done under the military law and punishable for it, does not relieve him of the liability to be tried under the civil law, if that same act is an offence under the civil law.

Mr. OLIVER: I quite appreciate that; but I am trying to draw attention to the particular condition of men in military service who have transgressed the civil law more or less unintentionally, where the parties aggrieved assume to take action against them. My hon. friend has said that that action can be taken. I desire to say that there are serious difficulties in taking such action, and there are certain reasons of public policy which may be very well appreciated why that action should not be taken, and to that extent, the condition is not the same as in the case of an ordinary elector.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not want to suggest that a soldier is not in any respect under any circumstances in any different position from a man who is not a soldier. It would be pretty difficult to get down exactly what the different circumstances are. I move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: When will this discussion be resumed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: On Monday, if possible. I understand that there was to be some discussion with regard to the report of the committee appointed to investigate the question of boots.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is the first order, but the next order will be this?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

THE CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES.

PRESENT MOBILIZATION AND ORGANIZATION.

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

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I moved the House into Committee of Supply for a purpose which I mentioned to the right hon. leader of the Opposition at six o'clock. It seemed to me desirable that some information should be afforded to the House as to the present condition of mobilization and organization of the Canadian expeditionary forces. I do not propose to introduce any unnecessary matter; and I will premise by giving a brief statement of what was announced last autumn as the intention of the Government, immediately after the departure of the first contingent.

On October 19, an announcement, which was carefully considered, was made to the effect that from that time until the end of the war, or so long as the War Office should deem it advisable, Canada would keep continuously in training and under arms 30,000 men. It was also announced that further contingents should go forward from time to time as might be required, and as the War Office should be in a position to receive them; and that upon each contingent going forward a number of men equal to the number which had been so despatched should be further enlisted, so that from time to time, during the continuance of the war, contingents would go forward as required, and 30,000 men would be kept continuously under training in Canada.

About a month later, on November 23, a further announcement was made that the number of men so to be kept continuously in training in Canada should be increased from 30,000 to 50,000. It was then pointed out that the number of men that could be usefully trained in Canada was limited by the following considerations:

1. Provision of necessary accommodation for them during the winter.

2. Provision of arms and equipment. Training for a lengthy period without arms and equipment is not considered very effective.

3. The necessity of organization by different arms and branches: infantry, cavalry, artillery, engineers, supply, transport, and medical services. A large surplus of some particular arm may be available, but is practically ineffective in itself.

4. The ability of the British Government to receive and finally train expeditionary forces from Canada, in view of their enormous task in training an immense army in the British Isles,

In the same announcement, it was laid down as above mentioned, that after taking into account all these considerations, it had been determined that the number of men under training could be increased in the immediate future to 50,000 in addition to about 8,000 troops engaged in

garrison and outpost duty; and that instructions would immediately be given that the additional number thus proposed should be enlisted forthwith. It was further announced that as soon as the second contingent should go forward, a further enlistment of 17,000 men would be made, bringing the total up to 108,000 men. It was also explained in the same memorandum, which was made public, that the forwarding of further expeditionary forces from time to time would be followed by the enlistment of men to take their places for training in Canada, as arranged in the proposals which had been made public on October 19.

I have very great pleasure in informing the committee that this programme has been carried out up to date. The result as given to the Minister of Militia by the Adjutant General shows that there are under arms and in training, including all ranks in Canada and abroad, the following numbers:

Overseas: the first contingent of the Canadian expeditionary force and the reinforcements which have since been sent forward, 35,420. In Bermuda, the Royal Canadian Regiment, 982. In St. Lucia, detachment for garrison, 100. In Canada, the second contingent of the Canadian expeditionary force, 22,272. Reserve Infantry battalions and Canadian Mounted Rifles, 27,079. Recruited and organized for overseas service, but not mobilized, 3,500. Total overseas forces, either abroad or organized at home, 89,353 men. In addition to this there are in Canada units of the active militia on active service, garrison and outpost duty, 9,777 officers and men, and the permanent force, 2,430 men, making a grand total of 101,560 men now under arms, either in Canada or abroad.

In order to enable the committee to estimate the numerical strength of that force, I may point out that it constitutes a force more than four times greater than the British force under Wellington's command at Waterloo; and it is nearly double the total force of either Wellington or Napoleon at Waterloo. I think that the House and the country may congratulate themselves that, in a period of not more than eight months, so great a force as this has been organized, and to a very considerable extent armed and equipped. The number of guns which went abroad with the first contingent is nearly as great as the total number of guns that Wellington had at his disposal in the battle of Waterloo. Of course, it is not a great army, compared with the enormous armies that have been marshalled on the plains of Europe; but considering the fact that this country has never intended or desired to possess a great military organization, I venture to say that the results achieved during that comparatively brief period may be regarded as thoroughly satisfactory, in view of the conditions of urgency under which the undertaking was carried out. We must not forget that a modern army is, to a very considerable extent, a great business organization. It is useless to have men without drill and training. It is equally useless to send them into battle without thorough organization in all the arms of the service to which I have alluded. It is also useless to organize an army without a thorough equipment of rifles, ammunition, guns, stores, supplies, commissariat, medical services and everything that goes to make up the wonderfully complex organization of a great modern army.

To summarize, there have been sent abroad over 36,000 men and in fulfilment of the programme laid down last autumn there are in training in Canada for further expeditionary forces about 53,000 men; or if account is taken of the units of the active militia on active service and of the permanent force, there are in Canada now in training or under arms over 65,000 men.

I would like to observe also that the physique, character and intelligence of these men, both those already sent overseas and those now in training in Canada, are all that could be desired and such as reflect the greatest credit upon this country. Those of us who have had the opportunity, which has been afforded to me, to see the various regiments in different parts of Canada, and those who have had merely the opportunity to see those regiments which have passed through Ottawa or to observe the men who are carrying on their training upon the grounds of Parliament, must certainly feel that Canada has every reason to be proud of her sons who are about proceeding to the front to represent her cause and defend her interests upon the battlefields of Europe.

For further information I may refer to a memorandum which has been prepared for the Minister of Militia by the chief of the general staff. The first division under General Alderson and the Princess Patricias Canadian Light Infantry and a number of administrative units are in France. The Royal Canadian Regiment is in Bermuda, and a detachment of Canadian artillery has been sent to the West Indies. The Royal Canadian Dragoons, Lord Strathcona's Horse and the Royal Canadian Horse Artil

lery have been included in a mounted brigade which, under the command of General Seely, remains for the present in England. The second Canadian contingent, that is the second Canadian division, with certain units required for administrative purposes, is still in Canada; but as soon as it can be suitably accommodated in England its embarkation will proceed.

It is proper that I should make here a statement which may set at rest more or less comment in the press and more or less surprise which has been manifested from time to time at the delay which has taken place in sending forward the second contingent. That contingent could have been despatched so far as we are concerned, at least three months ago; and the War Office was fully informed of that fact and has been kept advised from time to time that it could be sent forward whenever desired. The date at which it shall go forward was arranged some two months ago. Hon. members will of course understand that it would be absolutely contrary to the public interest that I should give to them any information as to that date. I desire to make this statement for the purpose of setting at rest any suggestion that this contingent is not ready to proceed or that it has not been ready to proceed for the last three months. We know perfectly well the reasons on account of which the War Office have thought it not desirable that the second contingent should proceed to Britain at an earlier date. Those reasons commend themselves to the judgment of the authorities of the War Office and we have seen no reason whatever to differ from the view they have taken. Hon. gentlemen will remember that there are a great many essentials to be taken into account before an army can be sent to the front and all the different arms of the service organized. They will remember also that the enormous numbers of men now under training in Great Britain render it not the easiest task in the world for the authorities of the War Office to make provision for the proper accommodation and training of contingents coming from the overseas dominions; and they will perhaps readily believe that owing to the unfortunate conditions which confronted our men during the past winter upon Salisbury plain the authorities of the War Office and specially Lord Kitchener himself are thoroughly anxious that when the second contingent of the Canadian expeditionary force does go forward there will be no room for any possible criticism in that regard.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

In the meantime it has been thought by the War Office that the training of the men could proceed as effectively in Canada as in Great Britain; and thus the date at which they are to go forward has been delayed. In all this we have followed precisely and absolutely the desire and the expressed wishes of the authorities of the War Office.

Up to the present no call has been made on the Canadian Mounted Rifles; but their turn is likely to come whenever the tactical situation changes in the western theatre of operations. I am informed by the Minister of Militia that we are within reasonable distance of the time when a Canadian expeditionary force of some 50,000 men will be serving overseas; and the chief of the general staff further advises him that in order to maintain that force in strength and efficiency a continuous supply of reinforcements, properly trained and fully equipped, will need to be provided; to say nothing of remounts and constant replenishments of material of every kind. The total necessities cannot be absolutely determined, because it is impossible to say with anything like certainty how long the war will last; and it is obvious that the conditions which at present govern the conduct of the campaign in Europe are likely to change in the course of time. But we know there are certain data upon which the necessities of war can be calculated, and reinforcements must be prepared on a corresponding scale.

Now, with a view to this the Minister of Militia and Defence, in consultation with his officers, has made provision for the establishment of overseas training depots, one or more for each arm of the service. Already some of the surplus units which embarked with the first contingent are being utilized for the purpose. These depots will be kept supplied by units maintained in Canada, and will furnish drafts for the units serving at the front. So far as can at present be foreseen, we are informed by the general staff that a total of 150,000 men will be required if the war should last another year: That is to say, an original force of 50,000; in addition to that 50,000 men sent overseas for reinforcements; and in addition to that 50,000 men kept under training in Canada, according to the announcement which was made in November last. It must be obvious that this is a very considerable undertaking, and that anything in the way of an absolutely cut and dried plan cannot be laid down at the present moment beyond that which I have already indicated to the

committee. In war the unexpected often happens, and our own arrangements must be subordinated to the needs of the Empire as a whole.

I should like also to read for the information of the committee a memorandum which goes into the whole subject in somewhat more detail, and which has been prepared for the Minister of Militia by the Chief of the General Staff. There are certain tables annexed to this report in the form of an Appendix which I would like the committee to excuse me from reading, and as to which I would also ask the consent of the committee that they may appear in Hansard, as I think they will be useful for the information of the House. I mentioned this suggestion to the right hon. leader of the Opposition at six o'clock, and he told me there would be no possible objection to it. However, I will read the main part of the memorandum, and all that I think will be of interest at the moment.

Canadian Expeditionary Force—April 8, 1915.

Memorandum setting forth the present Organization and Status of Canadian Expeditionary Force.

The Canadian expeditionary force as at present organized is made up as follows:

I. The First Contingent—
  1. The 1st Division, C.E.F.
  2. Army troops and surplus units.
  3. Line of communication units.

II. The Second Contingent—
  4. The 2nd Division, C.E.F.
  5. Line of communication units.

III. A force of Canadian Mounted Rifles.

IV. An Infantry Reserve.

V. Depots.

---

1. The First Division, C.E.F.

The first division (about 18,000 strong) is in the field. It includes:

Infantry: Twelve battalions (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 7th, 8th, 10th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th) grouped into three brigades.

Mounted Troops: A squadron of cavalry and a cyclist company.

Artillery: Forty-eight 18 pr. and four 60 pr. guns, with ammunition columns.

Engineers: Three field companies.

Signal Service: A divisional signal company.

Supply and Transport: A divisional train (four companies A.S.C.)

Medical Service: Three field ambulances.

2. Army Troops and Surplus Units.

The following units accompanied the 1st Division but are not included in it:

The Royal Canadian Dragoons and Lord Strathcona's Horse, "A" and "B" Batteries, Royal Canadian Horse Artillery, an automobile machine-gun brigade, and six battalions, including the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry.

The cavalry and horse artillery have been posted to a mounted brigade commanded by Brigadier-General the Right Honourable J. E. B. Seely, D.S.O. The brigade is still in England.

So also, it is believed, are the automobile machine-gun batteries.

Of the infantry, the 6th, 9th, 11th, 12th and 17th Battalions are in England. The 6th, composed exclusively of detachments from mounted corps, serves as a depot for the purpose of providing cavalry reinforcements; the 9th, 11th and 12th furnish reinforcements for the infantry; and the 17th, to which no special rôle has been assigned, forms a general reserve.

The Princess Patricia's C. L. I., allotted to the 27th Division, is in France, where it has already distinguished itself.

3. Line of Communication Units.

Line of communication units are the administrative units which are required for duty on the railways, roads and navigable waterways between an army and its base or bases of operation.

The units shown in the following list embarked with the 1st Division, C.E.F., or were organized after it arrived in England:

Headquarters infantry base depot.
Headquarters general base depot.
Divisional ammunition park (mechanical transport).
Casualty clearing station.
Stationary hospitals (2).
General hospitals (2).
Advanced depots of medical stores (2).
Base depot of medical stores.
Base hospital (Clivedon).
Sanitary section.
Divisional supply column (mechanical transport).
Reserve park.
Railway supply detachment.
Field butchery.
Depot units of supply (4).
Advanced remount depot.
Mobile veterinary sections (2).
Veterinary sections (2).
Base depot of veterinary stores.
Advanced base ordnance depot.
Base ordnance depot.
Base army pay and record office (London)
Pay and sub-record office (Shorncliffe).
Overseas base pay depot (France).
Base post office.

II. The Second Contingent.

4. The 2nd Division, C.E.F.

	Stations (subject to alteration
Divisional Headquarters	Not yet selected.
4th Canadian Infantry Brigade.	
Brigade Headquarters	Toronto.
18th Battalion	London.
19th and 20th Battalions	Toronto.
21st Battalion	Kingston.
5th Canadian Infantry Brigade.	
Brigade Headquarters	Montreal.
22nd (French-Canadian) Battalion	Amherst, N.S.
24th Battalion	Montreal.
25th Battalion	Halifax.
26th Battalion	St. John, N.B.
6th Canadian Infantry Brigade.	
Brigade Headquarters	Winnipeg.
27th and 28th Battalions	Winnipeg.
29th Battalion	Vancouver.
31st Battalion	Calgary.

	Headquarters.
Divisional Mounted Troops.	Subject to alteration.)
Squadron of Mounted Rifles..	London,
Cyclists..	Toronto (with one platoon at Halifax.)

Divisional Artillery.

Headquarters..	Halifax.
4th Field Artillery Brigade ..	Toronto, Guelph.
5th Field Artillery Brigade ..	Winnipeg, Lethbridge.
7th Field Artillery Brigade ..	Ottawa, Kingston St. Jean, P.Q., Fredericton.
Heavy Artillery Battery and Ammunition Column	Halifax.
Divisional Ammunition Colu'n.	Halifax, Toronto, Winnipeg, Montreal.

Divisional Engineers.

Headquarters..	Ottawa.
4th, 5th and 6th Field Companies..	Ottawa.

Signal Service.

Divisional Signal Company..	Ottawa.

Supply and Transport.

Divisional Train (Headquarters and 4 companies A.S.C.)	St. John, N.B.

Medical Service.

No. IV Field Ambulance.. ..	Winnipeg.
No. V. Field Ambulance.. ..	Toronto.
No. VI Field Ambulance.. ..	Montreal.

Note.—There are being mobilized two armoured motor machine-gun units, one at Toronto and the other at Montreal. But whether or not they are to be associated with the 2nd Division, C.E.F., has yet to be determined.

5. Line of Communication Units.

The following line of communication units (possibly with others) will form part of the 2nd Contingent:

- Divisional Ammunition Park (mechanical transport).
- Casualty Clearing Station.
- Stationary Hospitals:
  - No. 3 (London, Ont.).
  - No. 4 (French-Canadian).
  - No. 5 (Queen's University).
- General Hospitals:
  - No. 3 (McGill University).
  - No. 4 (Toronto University).
- Divisional Supply Column (mechanical transport).
- Reserve Park.
- Railway Supply Detachment.
- Field Bakery.
- Field Butchery.
- Depots units of supply (2).

III. Canadian Mounted Rifles.

When the Army Council decided on the form which assistance from Canada should take, disappointment was felt, especially in the West, at the exclusion of cavalry and mounted rifles.

So long as trench fighting continued, mounted troops were not required on the European continent, in the western threatre of operations. But they were required in Egypt, which was threatened with invasion; and it was not unreasonable to suppose that before long the tactical situation in Belgium and France would undergo a change. Therefore it was decided to proceed with the organization of a body of mounted rifles; and thirteen regiments, as detailed below, are being mobilized:

1st C.M.R. Brigade.	Station. (Subject to alteration.)
Brigade Headquarters....	Winnipeg.
1st Regiment..	Brandon.
2nd Regiment	Victoria.
3rd Regiment	Medicine Hat and Edmonton

2nd C. M. R. Brigade.

Brigade Headquarters. ..	Sherbrooke.
4th Regiment	Toronto.
5th Regiment	Sherbrooke.
6th Regiment	Amherst.

Unbrigaded Regiments.

7th Regiment*..	London.
8th Regiment	Ottawa.
9th Regiment	Lloydminster.
10th Regiment..	Regina.
11th Regiment..	Vancouver.
12th Regiment..	Calgary.
13th Regiment..	Pincher Creek.

* Less one squadron sent to England as a reinforcement.

IV. Infantry Reserve.

In Canada, in addition to the twelve "first line" battalions included in the 2nd Division, C.E.F., there are twenty-four "reserve" battalions in various stages of development.

They are (or will be) distributed as follows, and up to the present they have not been brigaded:

Battalions.	Headquarters. (Subject to alteration.)
33rd..	London.
34th..	Guelph.
35th..	Toronto.
36th..	Hamilton.
37th (Sudbury district)...	Not yet selected.
38th..	Ottawa.
39th..	Belleville.
40th..	Amherst.
41st (French Canadian)..	Quebec.
42nd..	Montreal.
43rd..	Winnipeg.
44th..	Winnipeg.
45th..	Brandon.
46th..	Regina.
47th..	New Westminster.
48th..	Victoria.
49th..	Edmonton.
50th..	Calgary.
51st..	Edmonton.
52nd (Thunder Bay and Rainy River districts)..	Port Arthur.
53rd..	Prince Albert.
54th (British Columbia, Mainland)..	Not yet selected.
55th (New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island)..	Not yet selected.
56th (Alberta)..	Not yet selected.

The foregoing battalions will be utilized as circumstances require; in Canada for draft-giving purposes, or in England as training depots, or as complete units at the seat of war.

V. Depots.

In England, as previously stated, three infantry depots and a cavalry depot have already

been provided for the 1st contingent; the 23rd, 30th and 32nd Battalions have lately been sent over to serve as depots for the infantry of the 2nd Division; depots have also been formed for artillery, engineers, army service corps, etc.; and in Canada there are recruiting and training establishments for each of the units which the permanent force contributed to the 1st contingent and to the garrison of Bermuda.

An analysis of the numbers of the various forces, supplied by the Adjutant General, is hereto appended as Appendix "A".

Appendix "A."

Recapitulation.

	Officers.	Other Ranks.	Total.
Canadian overseas forces	3,698	82,055	85,753
Units recruited and organized for overseas service but not mobilized	90	3,410	3,500
Units of the active militia on active service in Canada	551	9,226	9,777
Permanent force in Canada	147	2,283	2,430
Total	4,486	96,974	101,460

Grand total, 101,460 all ranks.

Canadian Overseas Expeditionary Forces.

Recapltulation.

	Officers.	Other ranks.	Total.
Divisional Headquarters.	10	67	77
Cavalry and Mounted Rifles—			
1st Contingent	69	1,255	1,324
Reinforcements	6	151	157
2nd Contingent	6	167	173
3rd Contingent	360	7,051	7,411
Total	441	8,624	9,065
Artillery—			
1st Contingent	133	3,279	3,412
Reinforcements	25	792	817
2nd Contingent	98	2,873	2,971
Total	256	6,944	7,200
Machine Guns—			
1st Contingent	9	128	137
2nd Contingent	29	308	337
Total	38	436	474
Engineers—			
1st Contingent	39	708	747
Reinforcements	..	50	50
2nd Contingent	21	706	727
Training Depot	4	120	124
Total	64	1,584	1,648
Signal Service—			
1st Contingent	8	192	200
2nd Contingent	6	220	226
Telegraph Operators	..	80	80
Total	14	492	506
Infantry—			
1st Contingent	825	20,000	20,825
Reinforcements	108	3,291	3,399
2nd Contingent	447	13,094	13,541
3rd Contingent	588	18,775	19,363
Royal Canadian Regiment, Bermuda	27	955	982
Total	1,995	56,115	58,110
Cyclists—			
1st Contingent	5	88	93
2nd Contingent	10	211	221
Total	15	299	314
Supply and Transport—			
1st Contingent	62	1,552	1,614
2nd Contingent	51	1,707	1,758
A.S.C. Training Depot	18	160	178
Total	131	3,419	3,550
Medical Services—			
1st Contingent	122	1,317	1,439
Reinforcements	42	392	434
2nd Contingent	111	1,441	1,552
1st Con. Base Depot of Medical Stores	1	8	9
Advance Depot	1	5	6
2nd Con. Base Depot of Medical Stores	1	8	9
Total	278	3,171	3,449
Nursing Sisters—			
1st Contingent	184	—	184
2nd Contingent	238	—	238
Total	422	—	422
Remount—			
1st Contingent	10	89	99
Reinforcements	2	75	77
Total	12	164	176
Veterinary—			
Mobile Veterinary Sections	2	26	28
Veterinary Sections	5	221	226
Base Depot Veterinary Stores	1	5	6
Total	8	252	260
Ordnance—			
Canadian Ordnance Corps	1	14	15
Postal Service—			
1st Contingent	2	14	16
Postal Corps Depot, England	1	5	6
Base Post Office, Boulogne	..	10	10
2nd Contingent	..	15	15
Total	3	44	47
Railway Construction Corps—			
2nd Contingent	12	492	504
Pay and Records—			
Base Army Pay and Record Office, London, England	4	2	6
Pay and Sub Record Office Shorncliffe, England	2	2	4
Overseas Base Pay Depot.	2	1	3
Total	8	5	13

Grand total, 85,753 all ranks.

Troops on Active Service in Canada.

Recapitulation.

	Officers.	Other Ranks.	Total.
1st Divisional Area	4	182	186
2nd "	83	1,749	1,832
3rd "	37	632	669
4th "	28	616	644
5th "	25	499	524
6th "	208	2,709	2,917
Military District No. 10.	31	458	489
" " No. 11.	134	2,342	2,476
" " No. 13.	1	39	40
Total	551	9,226	9,777

Grand total, 9,777 all ranks.

Strength of the Permanent Force in Canada for the half month ending 31st March, 1915.

Unit and Headquarters.	Officers	Other Ranks.	Total.
Royal Canadian Dragoons—			
Regimental Dept., Toronto	9	113	122
Lord Strathcona's Horse (R.C.)—			
Regimental Dept., Winnipeg	4	121	125
Royal Canadian Horse Artillery—			
R.S.A. Reg. Headquarters and Dist. Est't, Kingston	3	41	44
Supernumeraries, Kingston	1	3	4
"C" Battery	2	163	165
Total	6	207	213
Royal Canadian Garrison Artillery—			
Staff, Halifax	4	54	58
Supernumeraries, Halifax	..	1	1
Nos. 1 and 2 Companies, Halifax	10	256	266
Staff, Quebec	5	40	45
Supernumeraries, Quebec	..	3	3
Nos. 3 and 4 Co.'s, Quebec	4	94	98
Staff, Esquimalt	1	19	20
No. 5 Coy, Esquimalt	2	59	61
Total	26	526	552
Royal Canadian Engineers—			
Regimental Staff, Ottawa	19	2	21
Supernumerary Staff, Ottawa	..	55	55
1st Fortress Co'y, Ottawa	..	129	129
2nd Field Co'y, Ottawa	..	59	59
3rd Fortress Co'y, Ottawa	..	18	18
Supernumeraries, Ottawa	..	20	20
Total	19	283	302
Royal Canadian Regiment—			
Regimental Depot, Halifax	6	191	197
No. 6 Station, Halifax	1	95	96
Instr'l Cadre, Halifax	3	55	58
Supernumeraries, Halifax	..	15	15
Total	10	356	366
C.P.A.S.C., Ottawa	16	156	172
P.A.M.C, Ottawa	15	67	82
CP.A.V.C., Ottawa	4	4	8
C.O.C., Ottawa	26	296	322
C.A.P.C., Ottawa	8	41	49
C.M.S.C., Ottawa	4	75	79
S.O.C., Ottawa	..	17	17
School of Musketry, Ottawa	..	13	13
School of Signalling, Ottawa	..	8	8
Total	73	677	750
Grand total	147	2283	2340

I venture to hope that the hon. members of the committee will not think that I have trespassed unduly upon their time or upon the time of the House in placing this information before them. We have been some months engaged in this war for the cause of liberty and democracy, in which the people of this Dominion in common with all the citizens of the Empire take so deep and absorbing an interest. The vast work which has to be carried on for the training organization and equipment of even one division so that it can effectively take the front can be better appreciated by those who have had something to do with it than by those who have had no such experience. But when one comes to the organization of a force which at the present time comprises more than 100,000 men operating at the front or in training or upon duty in Canada, I venture to think that the House and the country will realize that a work of very considerable magnitude and importance has been performed in Canada during the past eight months.

Let me conclude by expressing, as I have on many occasions in the past expressed, the very deep appreciation which I am sure is shared by all my fellow citizens, of the magnificent response which has been given in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific to the call to arms. No one of us doubted that when the need came the people of Canada would be ready to respond to the call but we rejoice that in every province and, indeed, in every community in Canada the response has been so warm, so loyal, so splendidly patriotic that every one of us feels to-day more proud than ever he did before of this great Dominion.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I do not know that it would be out of place if one whose business in Parliament it is to criticise should endeavour to express appreciation of the tremendous task that has lain upon the shoulders of the Government of this country since the beginning of the war, and in measured terms and with all due reservation express appreciation of

the manner in which those great responsibilities have been carried out. We do not at all forego our right, or, I should say, our duty of criticism.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: We desire to be considered as at one with the Government in every endeavour they have made to see that Canada takes her proper part in the tremendous struggle which is now in progress. We realize, as we believe our colleagues on the other side of the House realize, that this is not a fight in which Canada is taking part as an outsider, but that it is a fight in which Canada is taking part for her existence and for her liberty, as a part of that Empire which stands for liberty, and has stood for liberty for a thousand years. The failure of the arms of the Allies in the present struggle would undoubtedly mean the destruction of the autonomy of Canada and the liberties that we enjoy. This is not a fight to preserve the neutrality of Belgium; this is a fight to preserve the existence of the British Empire, and every man who feels that the power and the prestige of the British Empire is the best guarantee of the liberty of Canada and of the principle of liberty throughout the world, has only one duty in this war, and that is to do everything that he can to support those who are taking part in it.

At the moment the responsibility of dealing with Canada's share in the war rests upon our friends on the other side. We may criticise what they are doing, or the way they are doing it, but when we do make that criticism it is not with a desire of hampering their efforts, but rather with the hope that whatever has been done may still be done, and, if possible, done better. May I say that the details of the work of creating an army as large as my hon. friend has said, and much larger, in fact, than that which decided the fate of the world at Waterloo, is in itself a great task. In a country with a widely scattered population, in a country whose people for a full hundred years have had virtually no practical knowledge of war, where we have had our attention entirely occupied with advancing material interests, when the occasion arose, and when the business of war had to be taken up, it necessarily took some time for the change of ideas to penetrate the public mind. It was hard for those who had been born in times of peace, whose fathers had lived in times of peace, whose grandfathers only could remember a condition of war, to realize that we were face to face with circumstances which called for the sacrifices of warfare. I doubt if our people have fully realized yet how terrible this war is or how terrible the urgency of it is, but from day to day there has grown upon our people that realization, and I feel and believe with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that Canada has responded nobly to the call as far as it has gone.

However hopeful we may be of the early and victorious closing of this tremendous struggle, we can have no assurance as to the date at which it will take place. It is more than possible that, in so far as Britain is concerned, the war is only beginning, and it is only in the months that are to come that we throughout the Empire, and particularly here in Canada, will be able to realize to the full what the horrors and sacrifices of war are. I have every confidence though, that, whatever occasion arises, our people will meet it with a good heart, and that we will face whatever fate brings us with a courage and a devotion that will ultimately bring victory.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Resolutions concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE SUPPLY BILL

On motion of Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works), the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Blain in the Chair.

Mr. ROGERS moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ended March 31, 1915, the sum of $14,766,499.39 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS moved:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 31st of March, 1916, the sum of $156,496,333.73 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

THE SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. ROGERS thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 123, for granting to

His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1915, and the 31st March, 1916.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and the second time, considered in committee and reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.

Monday, April 12, 1915.

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

WAR SUPPLIES—BINOCULARS.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY, acting chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, presented the fourth report of said committee, as follows:

Your committee have had under consideration the purchase of binocular glasses for the Canadian expeditionary force, and beg to report to the House the evidence and documents in connection therewith.

From the evidence it appears a number of binocular glasses were of poor quality, low range and inferior effciency, but passed inspection and were paid for at an excessive price; and this was due to misrepresentation and inadequate inspection. Your committee therefore recommend to the House that the said evidence and all documents connected therewith be referred to the Department of Justice, with instructions to enforce restitution and to take such further proceedings as the law will permit.

SUPPLY BILL.

THIRD READING.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of Bill No. 123, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1915, and the 31st March, 1916.

Mr. MARCIL: Since the winding up of the Union Life Insurance Company, I have received several communications asking me to inquire from the minister whether he was satisfied that the Insurance Department had been properly reorganized since the superannuation of Mr. Fitzgerald, and whether it was properly manned and equipped for the performance of the duties it is called upon to discharge. The minister is familiar with the large interests the Canadian people have in life and other insurance companies, and the fact that this company had to be wound up has directed attention to this peculiar feature of our financial life. I am sure that an assurance from the Government that the interests of the public are being properly safeguarded would be very much appreciated.

Hon. W. T. WHITE: My hon. friend's question rather surprises me. If the Government had not confidence in the Insurance Department, we should certainly take such steps as would give us confidence. My hon. friend no doubt knows that the troubles of the Union Life go back some seven or eight or more years, the company having got into difficulties in 1909. Just at present I am not prepared to say that the Insurance Department was culpable or negligent in any way. On the contrary, a careful consideration of the whole question goes to show that the troubles of the Union Life were due to negligence or worse on the part of its directors and officers, and to the fact that under our insurance laws very wide discretion is given to directors in the investment of moneys of insurance companies. I have it in mind to introduce a Bill, of which I have already given notice, which I think will result in obviating a recurrence of certain of the troubles into which the Union Life Insurance Company got owing to the circumstances I have mentioned. In answer to my hon. friend's question, I may say that we have no reason at all to doubt that the Insurance Department is competent, or that it is giving proper attention to the duties that devolve upon it by statute.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

WAR SUPPLIES—BOOTS.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey) moved:

That Report A of the fourth report of the Special Committee to which was referred the report of the Board of Inquiry respecting boots supplied the Department of Militia and Defence be concurred in.

The said report is as follows:

The Special Committee, to which was referred the report of the Board of Inquiry consisting of Lt.-Colonel W. H. Hallick, E. A. Stephens, Esq., and Theo. Galipeau, Esq., respecting boots supplied to the Department of Militia and Defence and all matters pertaining

to such boots, beg leave to report as follows:

(1) The order of reference and the authority of this committee is contained in the following resolution:

House of Commons,

Tuesday, February 16, 1915.

Resolved, that the report of the Board of Inquiry consisting of Lt.-Colonel W. H. Hallick, E. A. Stephens, Esq., and Theo. Galipeau, Esq., respecting boots supplied to the Department of Militia and Defence, a copy of which report was laid upon the table of the House on the 15th instant, and all matters pertaining to the boots so supplied to the said department, be referred to a special committee of seven members with instructions to investigate the matters aforesaid and to report thereon to this House.

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation and to report from time to time. That the following members shall constitute the said committee, namely: Sir James Aikins and Messrs. Lemieux, Macdonald, McCurdy, Middlebro, Nesbitt and Rainville.

Attest.

Thos. B. Flint,

Clerk of the House.

Monday, February 22, 1915.

Order.—That the name of Mr. Murphy be substituted for that of Mr. Lemieux on the said committee.

Attest.

Thos. B. Flint,

Clerk, House of Commons.

Your committee so appointed have held fifty-one sessions and heard the evidence on oath of eighty-seven witnesses.

Board of Inquiry.

Your committee find that the report of the Board of Inquiry particularly referred to it by the foregoing resolution is not complete, satisfactory or to be relied on, as the investigation made by that board and upon which its report is based was of a meagre and superficial character. The only persons called upon to give evidence, which was not given under oath, were four officers of the Department of Militia, three of whom were examined by your committee as were also all the members constituting that board. The board wrongly assumed that the boots to be supplied to the department were to be made according to a certain specification found in the department and judged them to be proper or defective as they complied with or departed from such specification, whereas the fact is that the boots were contracted to be made not according to specification but according to samples furnished or approved by the department.

Compliance with Contracts.

Your committee find that the boots contracted for after the beginning of the war and supplied to the Department of Militia and Defence under such contracts substantially complied with the samples provided or approved by the department according to which the boots were to be made.

Result of Inspection of Condemned Boots.

With a view of arriving at an accurate conclusion, as to the service which the boots in use by the solders training in Canada had given them, and as to the present condition of the boots, your committee ordered that all available used and discarded boots which had been condemned by various Regimental Boards of Inquiry throughout Canada be forwarded to the committee at Ottawa, your committee unanimously appointed two independent expert persons, one a large customs shoemaker and cobbler, and the other an experienced shoe manufacturer who had no contract with the Government, for the purpose of making a personal inspection, classification, and report of every pair of such condemned shoes so forwarded to the committee, and their full report is printed as appendix hereto. This report shows:

Number of said condemned or discarded boots forwarded and examined by such inspectors, of which there were 384 singles and 1,365 pairs		1,713
Of these there were rendered useless by the soldiers burning them		112
		1,601
Among them there were repairable boots to the number of, say		1,448
Leaving unrepairable		153
Of these unrepairable ones the condition was due to the following causes:		
Cut by toe nail	48	
Cut by knife or spur	22	
	—	70
		83

While 68 had not originally been equal to sample chiefly by reason of being too light in the backs.

At the conclusion of the above inspection and of our proceedings, the sealed sample number "12" which was the standard sample of the department was cut open by those two expert inspectors appointed by this committee, and one of them, Inspector Hoare, in the presence of the other inspectors swore that it was a good boot, the uppers of good calf, the outer sole of No. 1 tan up to gauge, with a leather counter and shank and all fully up to the said departmental specifications, and that in making their inspection and report they had made their findings on the basis of this sample boot as the standard.

According to statistics furnished to us by the department the total number of boots condemned in Canada by the various regimental boards to date is 7,807, of which the above boots examined by our inspectors formed part, and assuming that upon examination we classify the total number upon the same basis and in the same proportion as above, the result would be about as follows:

Repairable boots	6,599
Boots injured by burning	510
Boots mutilated by knife, spurs and toe nails	319
Leaving balance useless due to other causes	379
	7,807

Your committee, therefore, having in view the fact that the above represent the condemned boots, out of the great number, 86,000, issued to and worn by those now in training in

Canada; and having in view also the fact that in the earlier months of training no regimental cobblers or dubbin had been provided by the department, find that our inspectors' report corroborates the view that the boots supplied by the manufacturers were up to sample.

Sample Militia Boot.

The pattern and sample boot of the department, referred to in the evidence as Exhibit 5, 12, 55 and 57, which are substantially identical and constructed on the same specifications is made of chrome tanned, winter calf in vamp and top, unlined, of "E" and "F" widths, with solid leather counter, leather shanks, outsole English or Canadian oak, ten gauge thickness, slip sole of the same material six gauge thickness insole of similar material, the heel solid leather lifts compressed, Goodyear welt, the bottom filling "Fillo" composed of ground cork treated with cement, durable and waterproof.

We find from the evidence that in material and construction the boot is a good one.

The military boot adopted by the Department of Militia and Defence about 15 years ago was similar to the present boot, Exhibit 5, 12, 55 and 57, according to which the latter boots ordered and supplied since the outbreak of the war were in compliance. Many of the boots contracted for, however, were made with wider lasts but otherwise substantially like the said sample. Owing to a claimed shortage of winter calf contractors were permitted to use side leather in the later deliveries of the first orders. There is a dispute among experts which is the better for a military boot. The evidence shows that some improvements were made from time to time in the original sample boot but its general character was maintained. The boot so adopted by the department was used by Canadian soldiers in the South African campaign where, according to the evidence of Sir William D. Otter, it proved satisfactory.

Both before and after the South African war the question of adopting the British army boot had been taken up by the department, who declined to adopt it and adhered to the Canadian boot. In 1905, with the experience of the South African campaign, specifications were drawn and approved, and a sealed sample boot conforming thereto and similar to the..... present sample was again adopted by the department.

In February, 1910, the committee on ankle boots, having discussed several complaints regarding their quality, brought to the notice of the Secretary of the Militia Council by District Officers Commanding, recommended "a few pairs of 'boots, ankle, steel billed' as used in the British service, and a supply of samples or the leather used in the manufacture of British army boots, be obtained from the War Office, and that 100 pairs of boots be made, as nearly as possible up to the style, weight and class of leather, etc., in the British samples."

On March 1, 1910, Brigadier General Macdonald, the Quartermaster General, again favoured the Canadian boot and said: "I do not approve of the proceedings of the board. I am of opinion that if the boots are delivered up to the pattern as previously approved no complaint should arise as to these articles. The original supply of these boots gave every satisfaction."

From March, 1910, till February of the following year, modifications on the boot and a revision of the specifications were considered by the officers of the department and C. E. Slater acting with them, samples were submitted with steel bills which were not approved. On the 4th February, 1911, the revised specifications prepared by the said C. E. Slater, together with samples made according to these specifications were again sealed as the pattern for the Canadian boots, and these remained the approved pattern of the Canadian boot down to the outbreak of the war in August, 1914, notwithstanding the fact that in April, 1914, some suggestion was again made of adopting the British army boot, which pattern was then submitted to the department for its information, and on the 24th April the Director General of Clothing and Equipment in his report said: "The British army boot appears much too heavy for wear in Canada," and Colonel Brown, the inspector, on the 30th of April, 1914, concurred in this opinion.

See pages 29 and 45 to 55 of appendix and evidence.

As previously pointed out, it was a boot similar to the Canadian military boot, Exhibit 5, 12, 55 and 57, which was used with satisfaction in South Africa by the Canadians, and General Sir William Otter, in his evidence before the committee said:

Q. How long were you in South Africa?—A. Fourteen months.

Q. In active service all the time?—A. All the time.

Q. What boots did your regiment have during that time?—A. It was a boot issued by the department before we left.

Q. How did that boot answer the purpose in South Africa?—A. Well, it answered very well. I have no fault to find with it.

Q. How did it compare with the English boot?—A. Personally I liked it better for the simple reason that it was a bit lighter. Our men were not accustomed to wearing heavy boots like the English boot, but they had to wear it at times because we got the English boot eventually as our own wore out. My experience, however, is that our own men were better satisfied with the boot they brought out, with the Canadian boot, because it was lighter.

As will be seen later on in this report, all the soldiers who were at Salisbury Plain on active service who appeared before the committee and gave evidence were favourable to the Canadian boot which they wore and compared with the English army boot expressed a preference for the Canadian.

The Canadian sample boot and those made according to it do not appear to have been suited to withstand the severe and exceptional weather conditions and other unusual circumstances to which they were exposed and the rough usage. Only a boot specially constructed for that purpose like a larrigan or bushman's boot might be sufficient. It must not be forgotten as the evidence demonstrates that even with such disadvantageous conditions created by the weather the Canadian boots were not at first given a fair chance owing to the impossibility of getting two pairs for each soldier within the limited time. The one pair was constantly on his feet and almost as constantly wet. There was no opportunity for drying and the leather then became soft and the soles easily worn away and the stitching of the soles in many cases loosened and caused a separation of the outer sole from the other part

of the boot. Further, at first owing to the haste of mobilization a regimental shoemaker and kit and materials were not at hand to make needed repairs which would have prevented further rapid destruction of the impaired boots.

But because some of the boots were not sufficient to withstand such conditions and usage, boards of inquiry in different parts of Canada and at Salisbury condemned them. But these extreme tests are not fair tests for an average or suitable boot to be used generally by the soldier. The better test is—what military boot of reasonable cost is best suited to the general circumstances and conditions in which a soldier of a country on active service will be placed. Your committee were not asked to recommend a suitable military boot for Canadian soldiers nor were their inquiries directed to that end, but their investigations do show efforts made not only in Canada but in other countries to produce a satisfactory military boot. Those efforts have not yet been fully availing. The conceptions of each country as to the class of suitable military boot, conceptions influenced largely by the customs, conditions and climate of that country, vary and produce a boot considered to be best adapted to such usage, conditions and climate. So the British military boot is of one class, the American of a very different style, the French of another. The evidence given and the samples furnished to your committee show that the French and American military boots approximate more closely to the Canadian than do the heavy English military boot. Not only do the physical geography and climatic conditions of a country and the usages of its people enter into the determination of the class of boot required by its soldiery but the utility of the boot and the comfort of the soldier wearing it. The evidence before us shows that a heavy, hobnailed and inflexible boot will impede marching, weary the soldier and bruise or blister the feet, particularly of one not accustomed to such a class of boot, that a leather impervious to water by stuffing or greasing is also impervious to ventilation, evaporation of foot moisture and is to many feet injurious.

To indicate some of the many considerations necessarily involved in the selection of a proper military boot, extracts are given from a recognized authority, Edward Lyman Munson, Major Medical Corps, President of the American Army Shoe Board, in a book on "The Soldier's Foot and the Military Shoe," says:

"A good military foot covering should be well joined, strong, substantial and solid, yet at the same time sufficiently flexible to permit of the natural functioning of the joints. It must be supple, so as to avoid the undue loss of necessary energy in overcoming resistance of the leather with each step—likewise to reduce the liability to blister and other injury. To attempt to use a stiff, unyielding shoe will result in the early falling out of a large proportion of its wearers. No better example of this can be found than the tremendous disability which occurred among the Germans as a result of the use of a shoe of this character. The shoe must be comfortable. This is an absolute essential in military footwear, for uncomfortable shoes will inevitably diminish the ability of troops to march. The main wear of course falls on the soles. They cannot be increased in durability except by the use of double soles, which latter are unnecessarily heavy, stiff and hard on the feet. The foot covering should be as light in weight as is compatible with serviceability."

"The material of which the shoe is made, and the special treatment of the former, must be such as will facilitate evaporation of moisture from within, yet not to a degree by which the absorption of moisture from without is unduly favoured. Leather stuffed or saturated with oil was not used. The material or leather of the shoe upper must not be hard; otherwise it will cause blisters, callouses and corns. The 'brogans' formerly used in our service and the footwear of various foreign armies, have this defect. The sole should be sufficiently thick to prevent the foot from being injured by inequality in the ground. But if too thick, planter flexion of the foot is lost and dorsiflexion is much reduced."

In the House Documents of the 62nd Congress of the United States (1912), in the report of the Quartermaster General the following recommendations appear:

"That no shoe other than the official marching shoe in the form in which they may be adopted be used by officers or enlisted men when in the service uniform. That an order be issued to insure the proper fitting of shoes throughout the service, said order to cover the method of measurement, fitting and breaking in of shoes. That hereafter only vegetable tanned leather without oil stuffing be used in the manufacture of marching shoes, mineral tanned leather not being considered the equal of vegetable tannage for military service. That the specifications hereafter distinctly prescribe the minimum length of time in which shoes shall remain on the last."

Your committee conclude from the evidence given before it that for active service the sample boot would be improved by a second through sole instead of a slip-sole (this change was made before the second orders for the Canadian boots were given, and they were made accordingly); that it would be improved by putting more screws or nails in or quilting the outer sole so as to protect it from wear, and by making it wider at the toe (the large percentage of the boots supplied to the department since the beginning of the war were made on a last wider at the toe); and by protecting the heel by nails or other iron material.

Although your committee do not attach significance to the evidence of the manufacturer, Alfred Minister, yet as his statement that he refused to undertake to manufacture shoes such as he saw in the department and on specifications furnished because he did not want to make any money out of a man's life has been referred to by many people, and as he considered the prices of $3.85, $3.65 and $3.62½ for which others were furnishing boots on the same specifications were very low and as his higher offer for boots on the same specifications was not accepted, the following extracts from his evidence are given:

Q. In other words, you meant that you could and would make boots for the department at $4.85 after the war was on?—A. Yes I would.

Q. And it was on the specifications you had in your possession then that you made that offer?—A. So far as the material was concerned and workmanship.

Q. It was only a question of shape then?—A. Principally, so far as the boot we were going to make.

Q. I understand your main objection was to the shape of the boot?—A. That was the principal objection, and some little things in the workmanship.

Q. What were the other little things?—A. I did not think they were reinforced properly.

Q. What do you mean by reinforced properly; do you mean the soles were not reinforced?—A. Yes.

Q. Reinforced with additional nails?—A. Additional nails, and a different kind of nails.

Q. Anything else?—A. I do not know of anything else. (Page 694.)

Q. Well look at that shoe (Exhibit 12, departmental sample), what is your comment on that? First, as to the vamp leather, we will get the purpose afterwards?—A. That is a very fair shoe. (Page 694.)

Q. From your own experience in the Toronto Field Battery would you say that such a boot as Exhibit 12 was unsuitable for field battery work?—A. No, I guess that would have been all right for any work I had to do then. (Page 695.)

The evidence does not justify the committee in coming to the conclusion that with some such improvements as have been suggested the sample boot would not be a good, all round, serviceable Canadian military boot. Many witnesses of expert knowledge recommended different classes of boots, some a Standard Screw boot, others a Goodyear welt boot with more sole protection, some again a combination of the two. It is not a matter of surprise to your committee that the department has hesitated to depart from a sample which for about fifteen years has been approved by the Canadian Governments and given satisfaction to the Canadian permanent force and to Canadian soldiers in the South African campaign.

The Contracts for Boots.

We have shown the history of the Canadian military boot down to the outbreak of the war, August 4. Immediately thereafter the director of contracts received a requisition from the Quartermaster General (General Macdonald) for 65,000 pairs of boots, and on the 8th August he wired for tenders or had an interview with the following firms: Ames, Holden, McCready Company; Slater Shoe Company, both of Montreal; and Louis Gauthier & Company, Ltd., of Quebec; Tetreault Shoe Manufacturing Co., Ltd., George A. Slater, Ltd., both of Montreal; the Amherst Boot & Shoe Co., Ltd., Amherst, N.S.; Hartt Boot & Shoe Co., Fredericton, N.B.; and McPherson & Co., of Hamilton.

The first three mentioned firms had previously supplied the department with the militia boot, and the contract for this requisition of 65,000 was distributed as follows:

Ames, Holden & McCready, 20,000; Tetreault Shoe Co., 20,000; Louis Gauthier, 10,000; Slater Shoe Co., 1,000; Amherst Boot & Shoe Co., 2,000; John McPherson & Co., 6,000; and Hartt Boot & Shoe Co., 6,000, at $3.66.

All the boots under these contracts, which, with one exception, were dated on the 10th or 11th of August, were to be delivered in six weeks, and deliveries were commenced on the 21st of the same month, and continued as expeditiously as possible owing to urgent pressure from the department in order to enable the troops at Valcartier to leave at the earliest possible moment, during a very critical period in the history of the war, namely, the retreat from Mons.

Further, urgent orders were given in September and October to the following firms: Ames, Holden & McCready; Ballantyne & Martin; Cook & Fitzgerald; Western Shoe Company; Relindo Shoe Company; Wright Shoe Company; Aylmer Shoe Company, Murray Shoe Company; Humphrey Boot & Shoe Company; Perth Boot & Shoe Company; George Ritchie & Company; George A. Slater; Williams Shoe Company; E. T. Wright & Company.

The firms Ames Holden & McCready, Tetreault & Co., and Louis Gauthier & Co., manufactured from the sealed samples furnished to them by the department, but in all other cases the contractors manufactured from a sample presented by them to, and approved by, the department; and these manufacturers' samples we find were in all cases equal to, and in many cases superior to the department boot, by reason chiefly of their being a wider last and wider at the toe, the result being that the great majority of the boots furnished to the department had a wider last and toe than the departmental sealed pattern.

In all, boots were supplied to the department to the number of 80,600 pairs, in addition to large quantities of overshoes, rubbers and canvas shoes.

The contracts were made directly with the manufacturers who were asked to tender directly with the Government, on the boots in question, with the exception of some 5,000 pairs which were authorized and were purchased locally in Winnipeg for the men in training there, and 400 pairs purchased from a local firm at Esquimalt.

No commission was paid by the Government in any way, nor was it necessary for any middlemen or for any agent to intervene in order to secure such contracts from the Government, nor did any such intervene, although the evidence discloses that in one case an agreement was made in 1913, whereby Gauthier & Company agreed with one Charles E. Slater, who had formerly, as president of the Slater Snoe Company, done business for years with the Government, that Gauthier & Company should manufacture boots at an agreed factory price, and agree to supply them to the Government, adding thereto a certain commission, for the said Slater, which would be the difference between the agreed factory price and the price at which the said Slater, acting on behalf of the said Gauthier & Company, sold the said boots to the department less the freight and other expenses.

Slater represented to the minister that he was a partner of the said Gauthier.

That the only material variations made from the contracts by any contractors were a substitution of side leather in some cases for winter or storm calf; and this substitution in most cases was expressly permitted by the officers of the department; and that in any case, where such permission had not been obtained, a deduction was made from the contractor on account thereof.

We also find that the reason the officers of the department permitted the substitution in some cases of side leather for storm calf, was because the rush order for this quantity of boots had exhausted to a large extent the supply of storm or winter calf for a consid-

erable time, during the period of delivery of the first contract for boots.

In the month of October the department also altered the boot contract and specifications by requiring a through double sole in all boots manufactured thereafter, instead of the slip sole.

We find that this requirement was a material and beneficial improvement in the Canadian military boot, all witnesses being unanimous on this point, and that subsequently thereto all boots ordered were made to conform to this requirement, and a further price of 15 cents or thereabouts per pair allowed to the contractors in respect thereof.

Urgency.

War was declared on the evening of the 4th of August, the Canadian expeditionary force was authorized by Order in Council on the 10th of August to be despatched at the earliest possible moment.

As stated above, two days before this Order in Council was passed, a requisition had been made on the Quartermaster General for 65,000 pairs of ankle boots. In addition to the boots the Director of Contracts and the Militia Department were asked at the same time to provide at once: 35,000 caps, 3,000 cloaks, 15,000 great coats, 40,000 jackets, 33,000 pairs of puttees, 6,500 pantaloons, 50,000 suits of service clothing, 100,000 suits of underclothing, 100,000 flannel shirts, 150,000 pairs of socks, and supplies of more than twenty other different varieties.

And whereas, it had originally been intended only to despatch 22,000 men from Valcartier over 33,000 men were sent, and subsequently it was decided to mobilize the second, third and fourth contingents, until to-day it is estimated by the Government, that nearly 100,000 men are in the trenches in France, in training at England, or training in Canada, or doing duty as home guard; and all have had to be supplied with boots.

The time limit for the complete delivery of boots for the first contract was six weeks, and 55,000 of these were delivered approximately within the six weeks, deliveries in some cases commencing within eleven days after the order was given, and owing to the great demand it was at first impossible to issue more than one pair of boots to each man. The demand for immediate delivery was insistent both on the part of the department and of the enlisted omcers and men. It was not desirable to purchase boots from abroad even if this could have been done.

The great urgency, especially at Valcartier where the men were still wearing their worn-out civilian boots which prevented them from drilling, prevented as deliberate and critical an inspection as might otherwise have been made; that there might not be delay, and that deliveries might be made direct from the factories to Valcartier, inspectors were placed in some of the larger factories, where inspection took place during the process of manufacture; while for the reasons above stated a comparatively small percentage of the boots was delivered without inspection, we have no reason to assume that these boots so delivered were any different from the rest as the manufacturer had no knowledge as to whether they would or would not be inspected and therefore would likely, and so far as we can ascertain did, use the same care in making these boots.

Exceptional Weather and other Conditions under which the Boots were Worn.

In the first place, the boots were delivered to the soldiers at a time of the year which necessitated their being worn in the fall and winter months, especially those for the second and third contingents. Those in training in Canada were drilling and doing route marching almost daily either on the hard and rough ground or in the rain, snow, and slush, of an exceptionally mild and changeable winter; and substantially all the witnesses agree that during fairly dry weather the boots gave fair satisfaction, but when subjected to drilling and marching in the wet and slush, without an opportunity for drying or dubbin, the boots gave way more rapidly, until they were supplied with a second pair which enabled them to wear their boots alternately and thus gave them a chance to dry and be dubbined and repaired from time to time, and that the life of the boot depends, to a very great extent, on the care taken of it by the wearer was demonstrated by the evidence of many witnesses.

Some evidence was given of the exhaustive labours of the American Shoe Army Board of 1912, of which Edward L. Munson was president.

Your committee endeavoured to secure his attendance as an expert witness, but owing to his absence in the Philippines, we were unable to do so.

As to the normal life of the army boot, Professor L. Munson in his work on the army boot, has this to say:

"During the ordinary campaign, under usual conditions of moisture and roughness of roads as found in this country, a pair of shoes may be expected to last about two months and be sufficient, with slight repairs, for a journey of 500 to 600 miles over ordinary terrain. But local conditions may very materially modify and reduce this estimate. Rocks and sharp gravel rub away soles rapidly, particularly if wet; while continued wetting for a fortnight or so may cause the stitching to rot and the shoe to fall apart and become unserviceable."

With only one pair delivered to him, and those being continually wet, through route marching, drilling and otherwise in the snow, ice and slush, it was to be expected that the soldier would, on returning to camp, endeavour to get his feet dry.

In doing this we find on the evidence that in many cases the injury to the boots was caused by getting them burned in the attempt on the part of the soldier to dry his boots; and we find that a boot may be badly burned without showing indication thereof on the surface soles, while the deterioration to the inner sole on examination has been very apparent, and sufficient to cause the sole subsequently to break entirely across.

The constant alternate wetting and heating of the shoes without applying dubbin, we also find in many cases, has caused the shoe to more rapidly deteriorate.

As to the conditions to which the boots were subjected at Salisbury Plain, the only direct evidence that we have received points conclusively to a most abnormal and exceptional climatical condition. This evidence consists of that given by:

(a) Private Ross, of the Queen's Own Rifles, who appeared before us, swore that he enlisted at Toronto, August 25th last, going to Valcar-

tier. He sailed from Quebec on September 25; that after reaching Salisbury Plain it rained for 55 consecutive days, and the camp grounds were wet and muddy during the whole time he remained there, namely, up to the 18th of February, 1915.

(b) W. M. Bennett, of Walkerville, who was at Salisbury Plain once or twice a week between the 1st of November and the 16th of December, swore that the sun did not shine once while he was there that it was constantly raining, and that it was nothing but a quagmire of mud around the tents; that during the whole time he was there it was not possible for a soldier to step out on the ground around his tent without getting his feet covered with mud, and that the roads were in an even worse condition, there being from 1 to 14 or 15 inches of a thick batter of mud all over them.

(c) Wm. T. Nussey, sergeant of the Princess Pats, who was located at Salisbury Plain until the 13th of January, swore that he had talked with those living at Ainsbury, Fulford Market, Lavington, and Salisbury, and they informed him it was the worst weather they had ever experienced in 60 years.

(d) Corporal Edwards appeared before the board and swore: That he had been at Salisbury Plain as orderly to Colonel McDougal from October 10, 1914, till February 11, 1915; that it rained very nearly all the time except Christmas day; that he never knew a single day during that four months when the ground was not wet and muddy, and sometimes ankle deep, and that he had never seen such weather during his previous 20 years' residence in England.

(e) Major-General Hughes appeared before the board and swore: That he was at Salisbury Plain and saw the conditions of the camp there. The roads were so muddy one would go almost up to the knees in mud; that no boot ever made in Canada or England would stand the water and mud encountered at Salisbury Plain last winter, and that conditions at Salisbury Plain were no criterion by which to judge any army boots.

All evidence, then, as to the service the boots gave at Salisbury Plain, including the communications of Sir George Perley and General Alderson, to the effect that the boots were not suitable for the rough wear and wet weather of Salisbury Plain, must be read in the light of the above normal and exceptional weather conditions to which the boots were subjected.

The evidence, therefore, satisfied us that no boots under these conditions would remain water-tight, and that the conditions would constitute one of the severest strains to which any army boot could be put, and that it was to be expected that there would be complaints respecting the boots. Notwithstanding these conditions, however, the evidence of those who were in active service at Salisbury Plain who appeared before this committee proves that the Canadian boot stood the test well, and these witnesses were Sergeant W. T. Nussey, Private Ross, Corporal Edwards and Major-General Hughes.

Sergeant W. T. Nussey, above named, stated that he and his men were delivered 100 pairs at Valcartier and that up to the time he left Salisbury Plain in January, 1915, he had heard no complaints from his men respecting the boots; had worn his Canadian issue from Valcartier up to the time he appeared before the board, and was still wearing them, and left them with the committee as an exhibit. They were in fair condition, the uppers intact, and he had worn them continually without repair until the 6th of March, when he had them half soled and the heels repaired; and when giving his evidence described them as,—as good a pair of boots as he ever had on his feet; had worn both the British and Canadian army boot and preferred the Canadian boot, and that he had seen 12 years' service in the Imperial Army.

Private Ross, above named, swore: He had been issued his boots at Valcartier on the 30th of August, sailed for Salisbury on the 25th of September, was invalided home on the 18th of February, wore his boots during all this four months time with the exception of two weeks during which time he wore a pair of British boots and had his own re-soled, and the heels fixed with nails; that he discarded his British boots as he preferred the Canadian, and had been wearing his Canadian boots down to the 10th of March, seven months in all, that they were still in good shape with the exception of a few stitches in the back, and that he had never heard any of his companions complain about the Canadian boot, and that the English boot, which he wore for two weeks did not stand the water any better than the Canadian boot.

Corporal Edwards, mentioned above, when he appeared before the board was wearing the Canadian military boot which had been issued to him; he testified that he got them on the 5th day of October, after which he had gone to Salisbury Plain; that he had worn them ever since with the exception of a week, which would be nearly six months he had worn them in all, and about two months ago he had had them half soled; that they were still in good condition and he thought would last another three months; that before he had used the boots he had given them a good dubbin and had taken care of them ever since; that he had been wearing Canadian military boots for the last five years, and that he had not heard any complaints from the men at Salisbury Plain with respect to the boots.

Two pairs of British army boots were produced before the board by Major-General Hughes, and which he testified had been sent to him by Colonel Currie, commanding the 48th Highlanders, together with a letter from Colonel Currie stating that the boots had been in use for two weeks only; and, from an examination of these boots, we find that they have not stood the test as well as the Canadian boots worn by Nussey, Ross and Edwards.

In view of the evidence adduced before us and of our examination of samples of the standard British army boot, we are of opinion that it is not a suitable boot for adoption as the standard army boot of Canada.

Many of the boots which were condemned by the regimental boards at the various points in Canada have, since the regimental cobblers have been established, been repaired and are now in use. For instance, of 14,000 pairs issued at Toronto, up to and including the 19th of March, 1915, and of which 8,357 were issued before the New Year, only 413 pairs in all have been condemned, and of these 117 were repairable, leaving 296 unrepairable out of, say, 14,000, or about 2 per cent of the whole issue.

At Kingston of the total number of boots

issued, 2,400 pairs, 430 pairs were said by the Departmental Board to have gone back up to the 3rd of December, all of these, however, have been repaired and are still in use, so that the whole 2,400 pairs are still in use with the exception of five pairs which were cut up for inspection purposes. And Lt.-Colonel Hughes stated that if the men had had two pairs of boots issued to them in the first place, they would have had no difficulty at all, as this would have permitted them to dry, dubbin, and repair the boots; and his statement was corroborated by many other witnesses.

At Quebec.

Colonel J. P. Landry, officer commanding the 5th Infantry Brigade at Quebec, of the Canadian expeditionary force, testified there were issued 5,500 pairs to the men of his Brigade and only 55 pairs were condemned by the Boards of Inquiry, and that all of these 55 have since been repaired and re-issued to the men, so that the whole 5,500 are still in use, after doing service for some months.

St. Johns, Que.

Lt.-Colonel A. Sabourin testified that the maximum number of complaints was 40, of which 15 to 20 were because of narrow sizes, but that the boots apart from those at St. Johns, Que., were worn for four months in all kinds of weather, in the wet and slush, in drilling, route marching, and that these gave good satisfaction.

There seems to be a very erroneous impression with some, that paper was used in the manufacture and composition of the boots delivered to the department since the war began. For instance, Captain Taunton, Quartermaster of the 27th Battalion, C.E.F., stated that he had personally examined many of the boots issued to the Battalion on November 3, 7 and 8, and that the soles were composed of paper, wood, cork and leather scraps, grindings and glue. A similar error was made by Quartermaster Underwood, and Taunton subsequently admitted his mistake. The error lay in supposing that the leather board part of the wood or stool shank, an approved shank and used generally by manufacturers in the construction of good boots, was paper. We find that no paper or other fraudulent material was used in the construction of the soles or uppers of the boots.

It is quite true that to fill up the space in the sole between the edges of the upper leather, turned under the sole, ground cork, cement and glue were used. The filling so used is a specially prepared one called "Fillo" or "Besto" and is to be found in almost all boots of a good class and was required by the Militia Department in the boots to be made for it. In a specification concerning the boots and according to which the sample.....boots were made bottom filling is provided for as follows:

"Bottom to be filled with a preparation called 'Fillo' which is ground cork treated with cement, very durable and waterproof. Another preparation which the evidence shows to be equally good is 'Besto'."

See pages

The evidence further discloses that the number of boots supplied by each contractor forms but a small proportion of the annual output of each contractor; that in many cases such proportion is less than one per cent; others, less than two per cent, and in no case that we found was it more than 4¼ per cent of their annual output. And, speaking generally, one may reasonably conclude, apart altogether from patriotic reasons, that the manufacturer would not care to risk his reputation, as such by supplying an inferior article to the Government, when the quantity supplied represented such a small proportion of his annual production.

The Suitability of the present Canadian Military Boot.

As before stated, the present boot is the evolution of over 15 years of thought by the permanent officers of the Militia Department. In evolving the boot, which was the approved military boot at the opening of the war, the department had also considered the British boot and the American boot, and had taken into consideration the opinion gathered, and the report made by the said American Army Shoe Board in 1912, and had before them the sample boot which was the product of the conclusions of that committee which went into the matter very exhaustively. The American boot was produced before us as an exhibit, and proved to be a boot somewhat lighter in general, and also in the soles, than the approved departmental boot, though it was built on a wider and more roomy last, especially at the toe. It was a Goodyear welt shoe.

Evidence was also adduced before us that the French, Belgian, Italian Governments use a Goodyear welt.

A number of Canadian manufacturers, who might be deemed experts, testified that the Goodyear welt, re-inforced with hob nails on the soles and plates on the heels was the proper shoe, for ease, comfort and dryness of the feet, but that to combine it with the Standard Screw would counteract well known advantages of the Goodyear welt shoe, although they admitted that the Standard Screw might wear longer, but would not keep out the water as well as the Goodyear welt, and was not as comfortable.

Other manufacturers, and other experts, maintained just as stoutly that it would keep out the wet and would wear much longer, and would be a much more serviceable boot; and they saw no particular objection to a combination of the Standard Screw and the Goodyear welt, but rather approved of it.

The department has appointed a Sub-Committee of Council, acting in conjunction with a Special Committee of experts, and had also appointed a special boot expert, with a view of finally and definitely arriving at a conclusion as to whether or not the present departmental boot could be further improved, and if so in what manner, and this matter is still under consideration.

Your committee held fifty-one sittings since their appointment, on the 16th of February last, and have examined eighty-seven witnesses whose names are appended hereunder, including permanent officials of the Militia Department; the members of the particular boot inquiry whose report was referred to us; the departmental boot inspector; many manufacturers; a number of experts; a great many officers of the Militia Department, from various parts of Canada, and men who have served in the ranks in Canada and Salisbury Plain, and have worn the boots in question. And

every opportunity has been given with a view of placing the facts before the House.

Appended hereto are copies of the evidence taken before the committee comprising the exhibits submitted by the various witnesses.

Appended hereto, also, is a copy of the proceedings of the committee, dated Friday, April 9, 1915.

Appended hereto, also, is the list of the witnesses who gave evidence before the committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

April 9, 1915.

Mr. MIDDLEBORO said: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adoption of the report of this committee, I desire to say that it has held 51 sittings, possibly of an average of two hours each, and has examined over 87 witnesses. I also desire to testify to the patience and endurance of my colleagues on the committee, on both sides of the House, during the many weary hours we have spent in endeavouring to elucidate all the facts in connection with the supplying of boots to the Department of Militia and Defence. By reading the authority of the committee, which was by way of a resolution passed on the 16th of February, it will be found to be in the following words:

That the report of the Board of Inquiry consisting of Lieutenant Colonel W. H. Hallick, E. A. Stephens, Esq., and Theo. Galipeau, Esq., respecting boots supplied to the Department of Militia and Defence, a copy of which report was laid upon the table of the House on the 15th instant, and all matters pertaining to the boots so supplied to the said department, be referred to a special committee of seven members with instructions to investigate the matters aforesaid and to report thereon to this House.

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation and to report from time to time.

That the following members shall constitute the said committee, namely, Sir James Alkins, Mr. McCurdy, Mr. Middlebro, Mr. Rainville, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Lemieux and Mr. Nesbitt.

Owing to the illness of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), the name of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) was substituted on the committee. It will be observed from this that the first matter that was referred to the committee was the report of what I might call the Hallick Board, and, I presume, it was our duty in some way to report on that report. The committee were unanimous in coming to the conclusion that we could not rely upon the decision of that board. We came to that conclusion because the witnesses who appeared before that board were not sworn and because the members themselves had neither sufficient nor adequate knowledge of the matters that were referred to them. That the House may be satisfied upon that point I will read from the evidence of the members of the board themselves which will show what experience they had and whether they were competent to judge of the quality or class of boots which they examined. Mr. Galipeau upon being examined said:

Q. Have you been a manufacturer?—A. No. I have been in the jobbing business.

Q. That is the wholesale trade?—A. The wholesale trade.

Q. In what capacity in the jobbing business have you been?—A. Well, in general goods, all kinds of shoes.

Q. What were your duties?—A. I was a traveller.

Q. Then I understand that your occupation during most of that period has been that of a traveller for a jobbing house?—A. Yes, selling goods.

Q. That has been mainly your experience?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have never been a manufacturer of boots?—A. No, I have never been a manufacturer.

Q. Or with the tanning of leather?—A. Yes, I had in the heavy leather, not in the leather being used in these shoes.

Q. In respect of the leather that was used in the construction of the shoes, you have had no large experience?—A. No experience as to that.

Mr. Stephens' evidence can be summarized in this answer:

During all those years you acquired, as you have told us, a general knowledge of boot and shoe making, but never actually engaged in the work yourself? A. I never did.

Q. The same remark, I suppose, applies to tanning leather? A. I never was a tanner, and never engaged in it.

The replies of Col. Hallick, president of the board, were as follows:

Q. Have you had any experience in the manufacture of boots?—A. None whatever.

Q. Or as a dealer in boots?—A. None whatever.

Q. Then your experience in boots comes from that which you gained as an officer in the Ordnance Department, and from the wearing of the boots.—A. And as a soldier.

Q. But you are not a boot expert?—A. No, I do not pretend to be that.

Q. Who was the expert in that inquiry upon whom you depended?—A. Well, upon my two assisting members, Mr. Stephens and Mr. Galipeau. They were appointed as members to assist me in the investigation.

So, I think it will be seen that we were right in putting aside altogether the report of Lt.-Col. Hallick and his board. In doing so we are not casting any reflection whatever upon the gentlemen who constituted that board. We believe that they performed their duties faithfully and that they arrived at their conclusions honestly, but they had not had sufficient experience, and in addition to that, they did not have sufficient boots before them to enable them

to come to a fair and accurate conclusion as to the quality of the total number of boots which had been supplied to the department. The members of the committee who put in a minority report said in their report that:

> The witnesses before the Board were not sworn and were confined to department officials, all of whom with one exception have, however, been before your committee and given their evidence under oath. This Court of Inquiry in addition to hearing the witnesses, devoted themselves to an examination of the boots referred to in their report and their findings express merely the opinions of the different members of the Court.

Notwithstanding that, the minority proceed in the minority report now submitted to give some of the conclusions that were arrived at by the board. If we are not going to accept the report in toto we have no right to accept any part of it. The part which they accept in the minority report and which they wish to place before the public is this:

> The opinion of the Board may be summarized in so far as the character of the boot prescribed and supplied by the department, is concerned, as follows:
>
> That the boot was of unsuitable shape and make and that the leather contained no water-resisting medium;
>
> That the heels and soles are unprotected and sole-filling is often poor quality;
>
> That the boot was unsuitable for the soldiers and for the particular work for which they were provided;
>
> because,
>
> (a) The shape is such that the average foot has not room for the free movement of the toes and is thus not suitable for marching;
>
> (b) The leather is dry, containing no grease, and consequently quickly absorbs the water;
>
> (c) Soles and heels not being re-inforced with metal, soon wear down, especially when wet.

But this is expert opinion, and they are not experts. If they were justified in citing that portion of the report they should have cited also the portion of the same report in which the same board held that:

> The boots manufactured for the Canadian overseas division were generally speaking well made and of good quality (surprisingly so considering the very insufficient time given the contractors), but they were not suitable for the particular work for which they were provided. This, the Board considers, can be attributed to want of time, as the (comparatively speaking) enormous demand had to be met within a few weeks. Further, that owing to the same extreme urgency, it appears that there was not enough time in which to consider new specifications for a boot differing with that which though suitable for a dry climate has been found to be unsuitable in the abnormal conditions in England. Consequently the Board recommends the adoption of a heavier, sounder type of boot, similar to that used by the British Army.

I think the fairer way is to disregard the report entirely because we have had all the members of the board before this committee and placed them on oath in addition to all the witnesses whom the board heard, with one single exception, and, instead of coming to our conclusion upon a very small proportion of the boots supplied as they did, we have called for statistics from the department of all the boots rejected throughout Canada and have arrived at our conclusion upon that basis.

The next question that naturally arises is: Where did this standard Canadian military boot come from, what is the history of the standard boot which was in the department at the time of the declaration of war, and who is really responsible for that boot?

In the minority report, at page 599 of the Votes and Proceedings, I find this statement:

> The boot supplied to the soldiers who went to South Africa was a different boot from the sealed sample boot of 1914, and from the boots supplied to the overseas forces.

Well, let us see if it was a different boot. I will concede that it was a different boot in the respect that it was a better boot, and that the boot of 1914 was a great improvement on the boot of 1899, which went to South Africa. That there may be no dispute on this question, I shall read from the evidence of the witnesses who appeared before our committee upon this point. At page 928 of the evidence, General Otter testified:

> Q. How long were you in South Africa?—A. 14 months.
>
> Q. In active service?—A. All the time.
>
> Q. What boots did your regiment have during that time?—A. It was a boot issued by the department before we left.
>
> Q. Similar to Exhibit 12, that boot I showed you?—A. That description of boot, yes.

I may say that Exhibit 12 is the boot from which the manufacturers manufactured the boots in question, with the exception of those manufacturers who forwarded their own sample boot to the department, had it approved by the department and made the boots accordingly. General Otter's evidence continued:

> Q. How did that boot answer the purpose in South Africa?—A. Well, it answered very well. I have no fault to find with it.
>
> Q. How did it compare with the English boot?—A. Personally I liked it better for the simple reason that it was a bit lighter. Our men were not accustomed to wearing heavy boots like the English boot, but they had to wear it at times because we got the English boot eventually as our own wore out. My experience, however, is that our own men were better satisfied with the boot they brought out, with the Canadian boot, because it was lighter.

Q. I do not know whether you were personally present at Valcartier or Salisbury?—A. I was not.

Q. You heard of the conditions that existed there?—A. You mean the weather conditions?

Q. Yes, the weather conditions?—A. No. We had rain in South Africa, but the weather as a rule was hot there, dry and hot.

Q. So you cannot say how this boot would answer in winter campaign?—A. No.

Q. You are not in a position to say that? All you can say is that it answered the purpose very well in the campaign in South Africa and for the purposes of the permanent corps in Canada?—A. Yes.

By Sir James Aikins:

Q. Did you suggest any improvement to the department when you came back from South Africa?—A. No, I suggested no improvements, because personally I was quite satisfied with the boot.

Charles Slater in his evidence at page 899 says:

Q. Then when did you commence supplying boots to the Department of Militia?—A. At the time the South African war broke out.

Q. What class of boot did you supply at that time?—A Practically the same boot that is being supplied now.

Q. We will look at Exhibit 12 and Exhibit 67 (producing boots).—A. Well, they are practically both the same last.

Q. And Exhibit 57 (exhibiting boot)?—A. It has not been changed any except in some minor features. For instance, we made them what we call a viscolized sole, an oiled sole.

Q. So I take it from you that looking at Exhibits 12, 67 and 57 these are practically the same boot which you supplied in 1899 to the Government of Canada for use in South Africa?—A. Exactly so.

Mr. McCann, who has been in the Militia Department for a great many years, gives this evidence, at pages 1035-1036:

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. When did the department make the issues of boots to the men who went to South Africa?—A. They began in October, if I remember rightly.

Q. How many were issued, could you find out?—A. I don't know that I could find out, but supposing two pairs were issued to every man, there would be 2,000 pairs. That is for the first contingent, which left in October, 1899.

By the Chairman:

Q. I suppose your object is to improve the boot from time to time?—A. That has been our object right along.

Q. And you think you have succeeded in improving it from time to time?—A. Well, speaking for myself, I think the boot (Exhibit 12) is a great improvement.

Q. That is, the boot, Exhibit 12, is a great improvement on this one (Exhibit 77)?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. That is not a sample of the boots supplied?—A. It is a fair sample of the boots we got in those days.

Q. Your boot, then, in 1905, would have been an improvement on the boot in use in 1899?—A. Certainly, sir.

Q. No doubt about it?—A. No doubt about it whatever.

Q. No question whatever?—A. No question whatever.

Q. The 1905 boot, you think, was a great deal better boot than that of 1899?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. And a great deal better than the boot that went to the South African war?—A. Infinitely better, to my mind.

Then, Major General Hughes, who was as we know in South Africa, gave evidence as follows:

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. The Canadian people would support you if months ago you had got them a new boot?—A. No, I say the Canadian people supported this boot in South Africa—of course it is a dry country—and all through all the soldiers have supported this boot, and personally I like this boot, but would like a little more room across there (front) and I would like steel across there (toe). Personally that is the only change I would make in the boot.

By the Chairman:

Q. It was designed in 1910?—A. Certainly.

Q. The last revised specifications are 1910?—A. Yes, but we wore in South Africa exactly the same boot.

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. That boot was never designed for active service?—A. Certainly for active service.

Q. That is designed for active service in the barracks in Canada?—A. It was designed for active service. That is practically the same boot we had in South Africa.

By Sir James Aikins:

Q. What do you say about that class of boot being worn in South Africa?—A. I do not say it is the same boot; I say it is a similar boot. Our fellows don't wear that heavy boot, like the English one.

Mr. McCann, again, in his evidence at page 1033, says:

Q. We have got a pattern sealed on 9th May, 1905?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that the sealed pattern that has been carried down to the present date?—A. Practically.

Q. Practically the same?—A. There are some slight difference I expect; I do not like to give a definite answer.

I want to show that from 1905 to 1910 that same boot continued to be the approved boot of the department. In 1910, on the 1st of March, some change was again suggested along the lines of the British boot, and the matter was taken up by the department, and we find that on the 1st of March, 1910, Brigadier-General Macdonald, the Quartermaster General, again favoured the Canadian boot, and in his letter he stated:

I am of opinion that if the boots are delivered up to the pattern as previously approved no complaint should arise as to these articles. The original supply of these boots gave every satisfaction.

We, therefore, have traced the history of this sample Canadian army boot down to 1910. On the 4th of February, 1911,

Charles Slater, who was then boot expert for the department, and to whom the department evidently looked for advice as to a proper standard military boot for Canada, again revised the specifications in respect to boots, and on these specifications other samples were sealed and they became the pattern boot for the department. In 1912, the American Army Shoe Board concluded its labours. The board had sat for a period of five years and it entered very extensively into the question of a suitable active service boot for the American army. I do not suppose any shoe board ever gave the same attention to details as to a proper boot for an army as was given by the American Shoe Board of which Professor Munson was the president. This board carried out extensive and practical tests all over the country; they examined the soldiers' feet by X-rays to see what position the feet occupied in the shoes, and they endeavoured to obtain all the expert medical and scientific knowledge obtainable, and their inquiry extended over a period of 4 years. The result of their labours was a standard boot which was exhibited before the committee and which had been considered by the Militia Department here. As the result of the report of the American Army Shoe Board, a military boot was evolved and adopted for the United States army, which was much lighter than the present standard boot of the Canadian Militia Department. Even as late as April, 1914, the question of adopting the British Army boot was again taken up by the Militia Department here, and I mention this to show that the department not only approved of the present standard of Canadian boot, but that it had very carefully considered all other boots. As late as April, 1914, a suggestion was again made that the new pattern boot of the British Army should be adopted by Canada, and a pair of these boots was sent to the department for inspection and consideration, and with the result that the following correspondence ensued. On the 27th of April, 1914, the following letter was written by H. W. Brown, Director of Contracts, to Lt.-Col. Macdonald, Director of Clothing and Equipment, with respect to the new pattern British Army boot:

Director of Clothing and Equipment:

Please see accompanying memorandum from Lt.-Colonel Brown, dated 15th instant., letter from George A. Slater, Limited, and newspaper clipping, all relating to the British new pattern chrome leather army boot, a sample of which is sent you herewith for examination, together with a pair of the Balata soles, referred to in the Slater Co.'s letter. Please return these after examination, as they were only loaned to Lt.-Colonel Brown by the company.

In this connection see also 96-10-30 sent you herewith.

(Sgd.) H. W. Brown,
Director of Contracts.

Lt.-Colonel Macdonald returned the letter to Mr. Brown with the following memorandum:

Noted and returned; thank you. The army pattern boot appears much too heavy for wear in Canada. As to Balata soles, the Q.M.G. does not approve of trying them out.

The new pattern British Army boot was returned to Lt.-Colonel Brown, chief inspector of boots, and he returned it to Slater & Company whence it originally came, and in the letter accompanying the boot, Lt.-Colonel Brown says:

April 30, 1914.

Gentlemen:

I am returning to you to-day via Canadian Express, prepaid, the one-half pair English army boots which you were kind enough to send me on April 9. The Q.M.G. considers it too heavy to issue to the men of Canada, and I think he is right.

This concludes the history of the boot right down to the opening of the war in 1914. Can any reasonable gentleman in this House or in this country say that this Government is in any way to blame for the approved sample of the departmental army boot which was in the department on the 4th of August, 1914, when war was declared? I do not think from the evidence that any reasonable person can say so. The boot was the product of the late Government, and it had done good service in the permanent force. A poorer boot had given satisfaction over the British boot in the only foreign service that we have ever had, that is, in South Africa. The American boot, adopted in 1912, after four years' deliberation, was a similar boot, although lighter and on a little wider last. When we came into power in 1911, we left in their positions all the permanent officials of the department appointed by the late Government, because they were men who had nine, ten, fifteen and some over thirty years' experience; but if we had changed those officials and had put in their places men who had not as large experience as they had, we would have heard of it to-day in the minority report. I am quite safe in saying that no person can blame the department for the boot to which I have referred being the approved boot of the department at the time that the war broke out. It was the practical active service army boot of the department; it is idle to say that it was anything else. We

have heard some members of the committee describe it as the dancing pump. Well, if they allowed a dancing pump to be the active service army boot of the department for the fifteen years they were in power, they are certainly a great deal to blame; but it was not the dancing pump, it was the only boot provided by the department for the last fifteen years for any service, active or inactive, that the permanent force had. There cannot be any contention that the boot was anything but an active service army boot, and to set up that contention now is merely a weak afterthought.

Having proved this sample boot, we come now to the question whether or not the sample boot was the boot delivered to the manufacturers, and I do not think it is necessary to argue this point in view of the evidence I have already submitted. What took place was this; there had been some firms manufacturing boots for the department for a number of years prior to the outbreak of the war. Those firms naturally would have the departmental pattern and last on hand, and therefore could manufacture boots more expeditiously than any other firms could, and they were told to go ahead and manufacture according to Exhibit 12, which was the sample of the department. We required, however, such a great quantity of boots that we could not confine ourselves to those firms, and so other firms came forward and said: We have not the departmental pattern and last, but we have a boot here which is just as good and which we think is better than the departmental standard military boot. Their sample was submitted to and approved by the department, and the firms went ahead and manufactured boots according to that boot approved by the department. The evidence is that, so far as they are concerned, the boots that they manufactured were fully up to the sample. Exhibit No. 5, of which the House will hear a great deal, was the sample approved and sealed in 1905 and called the Slater sample, and it is the sample which the witnesses say is the boot continued down to the present day. The director of clothing and equipment swore that Exhibit No. 5 was supposed to be identical with exhibit No. 12. Colonel Brown, Chief Inspector of Boots, swore that Exhibits 12, 53, 55, 57 and 67, which were boots similar to the departmental standard manufactured by the firms who had departmental lasts, were selected by him out of stock boots and were as close as possible to Exhibit 5. I want, however, to give the last and most conclusive evidence that we have. After our inquiry was practically through, we employed two competent, practical boot experts to inspect all the boots that had been condemned, and on the last day of our inquiry we asked those two experts to cut up Exhibit 12, the boot from which some of the contracts were made, and the evidence shows conclusively that the boot Exhibit 12, was made according to specifications prepared by Slater in May, 1905, and that the boots were manufactured according to the approved samples. There was no opposition on this point, and hon. gentlemen opposite have practically admitted that—

Mr. MURPHY: No.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: —that the boots were manufactured according to the sealed sample or according to the manufacturers' own samples submitted to and approved by the department; that therefore in all respects the manufacturers carried out their contracts and that the boots manufactured were equal and in many cases superior to the samples from which they were made. These two inspectors to whom I have referred were accepted unanimously by the committee. After they had cut up Exhibit 12, one of them, Mr. Hoar, in the presence of the other, Mr. Coté, gave the following evidence, as appears on the last pages of the evidence:

Q. What do you find with respect to the sealed sample No. 12. Take first the soles, after cutting it open?—A. The soles are 11 gauge.

And the specifications required only 10 gauge, so that the boots were better than the specifications in that respect.

Q. What sort of an inner sole do you find?—A. The insole is a good one.

Q. The insole is oak tanned?—A. Yes.

Q. What is the vamp?—A. Storm winter calf.

Q. What are the uppers?—A. The backs are of the same material.

Q. What are the counters?—A. The counters, oak tanned.

Q. And the heels you have already told us are of solid leather.—A. Solid leather, yes.

Q. What is the filling?—A. The filling is cork.

Q. Is that what they call Besto filling?—A. Yes.

By Mr. McCurdy:

Q. Cork and cement?—A. Cork and cement.

By Mr. Pringle:

Q. Having cut the boot open, what do you say as to the quality of the leather?—A. I say that it is a good boot.

By Sir James Aikins:

Q. What is the size of the outer leather?—A. 11 gauge.

Q. And the slipsole?—A. It is 7 gauge.
Q. The inner sole?—A. 7 gauge.
By Mr. Macdonald:
Q. Of course this information another manufacturer could not get without cutting the boot?—A. No, not unless be opened the boot.
By Mr. Murphy:
Q. What kind of a shank is it?—A. Leather shank.
Q. Solid leather?—A. Solid leather shank. There it is. (Exhibiting shank).
By Mr. Nesbitt:
Q. How near that type of boot did you calculate when you were judging whether a boot was up to the sample or whether it was not?—A. We had this boot. Exhibit 12, under consideration.
Q. You did not cut it open?—A. No. The boots we did cut open were up to sample, except in a few cases, as the report states.
Q. Did you judge them on the basis of what you found them to be?—A. Yes, sir.
By Mr. Macdonald:
Q. According to specification?—A. Exactly.

So that we have a minute description of the sample, and we have sworn and positive evidence that the sample was made according to specification; and the specication is the specification prepared by Charles A. Slater and approved by the department in 1905, and continued down to date.

Now, let us get some of the fundamental principles of a serviceable military boot. I take these from the report of the American Army Shoe Board. And I may say that we wired Professor Munson, the president of that board, and endeavoured to secure his services before this committee, but unfortunately he was absent in the Philippines, and thus we were unable to secure the benefit of his counsel.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is he?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: He is president of the American Army Shoe Board who gave the conclusions of the board in 1912, and who was for some four years engaged in the investigations on the basis of which he arrived at his conclusions. Professor Munson says:

> The material of which the shoe is made, and the special treatment of the former, must be such as will facilitate evaporation of moisture from within, yet not to a degree by which the absorption of moisture from without is unduly favoured. Leather stuffed or saturated with oil was not used. The material or leather of the shoe upper must not be hard; otherwise it will cause blisters, callouses and corns. The "brogans" formerly used in our service and the footwear of various foreign armies, have this defect. The sole should be sufficiently thick to prevent the foot from being injured by inequality in the ground. But if too thick, planter flexion of the foot is lost and dorsiflexion is much reduced.

That is to say there is only one standard military boot for the United States army. It has been suggested throughout our investigation that the United States have a summer issue and a winter issue, and that perhaps the boot produced before this committee is the boot which the United States army had in summer. This report of the quartermaster general shows that the boot shown to the committee was the only issue they have for an active service boot, and it is lighter than the Canadian military boot. Professor Munson goes on:

> That hereafter only vegetable tanned leather without oil stuffing be used in the manufacture of marching shoes, mineral tanned leather not being considered the equal of vegetable tannage for military purposes.

Our specifications provide for the same chrome tanned leather as recommended by the quartermaster general of the United States.

Then, as to the life of an ordinary military boot. There seems to be some misapprehension in this country as to how long an ordinary boot is expected to wear. After his exhaustive inquiries this is what Professor Munson says:

> During the ordinary campaign, under usual conditions of moisture and roughness of roads as found in this country, a pair of shoes may be expected to last about two months and be sufficient, with light repairs, for a journey of 500 to 600 miles over ordinary terrain. But local conditions may very materially modify and reduce this estimate. Rocks and sharp gravel rub away soles rapidly, particularly if wet; while continued wetting for a fortnight or so may cause the stitching to rot and the shoe to fall apart and become unserviceable.

I would ask the House to bear this in mind when they consider the conditions under which the Canadian boot has been worn in the present campaign. Take Salisbury Plain as an instance. If we are to judge of the use of the Canadian boot there by the fundamental principles laid down by Professor Munson as to the life of the ordinary boot, we must allow for the fact that according to testimony before the committee, they had fifty-five continued days of rain. Such conditions, of course, meant a very short life for any army boot.

Now we come down to the actual contract for the boots. War was declared on the 4th of August. On the 8th of August a request was sent out by Quartermaster General Macdonald, asking them to provide at once 65,000 pairs of ankle boots. Such an order was, of course, unprecedented in the history of Canadian militarism. The only thing the department could do was to recognize that a certain number of firms had been making boots in the past for the Government, that

they had the Government lasts, and so would be able to turn out the boots more rapidly. So these firms were called upon to furnish the major portion of the first order. The department sent out invitations for tenders to a number of firms including these and asked how many pairs they could make, and stipulating that the boots must be delivered within six weeks. This invitation was sent to the following firms: Ames, Holden, McCready Company; Slater Shoe Company, both of Montreal; and Louis Gauthier & Company, Limited, of Quebec; Tetrault Shoe Manufacturing Company, Limited, George A. Slater Ltd., both of Montreal; the Amherst Boot & Shoe Company, Limited, Amherst, Nova Scotia; Hartt Boot & Shoe Company, Fredericton, New Brunswick; and McPherson & Company, Hamilton.

The first three mentioned firms had previously supplied the department with the Militia boot, and the contract for this requisition of 65,000 was distributed as follows: Ames, Holden & McCready, 20,000; Tetreault Shoe Company, 20,000; Louis Gauthier, 10,000; Slater Shoe Company, 1,000; Amherst Boot & Shoe Company, 2,000; John McPherson & Company, 6,000; and Hartt Boot & Shoe Company, 6,000. These were all at $3.85, except the Hartt Shoe Company, who had tendered at $3.66. These contracts were all dated the 10th or 11th of August, with one exception. Deliveries were to be made within six weeks. As a matter of fact, deliveries began within 11 days, and 55,000 pairs were delivered within the six weeks and the balance a very short time after.

Further, urgent orders were given in September and October to the following firms: Ames, Holden & McCready; Ballantyne & Martin; Cook & Fitzgerald; Western Shoe Company; Relindo Shoe Company; Wright Shoe Company; Aylmer Shoe Company; Murray Shoe Company; Humphrey Boot & Shoe Company; Perth Boot & Shoe Company; George Ritchie & Company; George A. Slater; Williams Shoe Company; E. T. Wright & Company. The first three firms manufactured from the sample furnished by the department. I am not quite sure, but there may have been one or two other firms that manufactured from the standard department sample. In all the other cases the contractors manufactured from a sample presented by them and approved by the department and manufactured in accordance with the approved sample. In all, nearly 180,000 pairs were supplied to the department. The first order was for 65,000.

[Mr. Middlebro.]

At that time it was based upon the assumption that we would send 22,000 men to Salisbury Plain. It was afterwards decided to send 33,000 men, and they were sent. And we know that, since that time, we have organized a second, third and fourth Contingents, until, as I see by the announcement of the Prime Minister last Saturday evening, we have in training here, in France, England and elsewhere, 101,500 men. Every one of these men has had to be supplied with boots. This was a herculean task, and one that had never been contemplated up to that time by the Militia Department. Then, I would point out the conditions under which these boots were worn in Canada. It so happened that they were delivered at a time of the year which necessitated their being worn in the worst part of the year. They were issued in the fall, where they had to undergo the rain and slush of that season, followed by the rigours of the Canadian winter and then the snow and slush of the spring. They could not be put to a more severe test as regards weather conditions. I venture to say that if the boots had been first issued in the present month and had been worn for the next six months, we should not have had any investigation such as we have had within the last few weeks in this House.

The evidence is to the effect that in the early history of the war there were no regimental cobblers. To begin with, only one pair each was issued to the men, and thus the wearers were not given a chance to dry them. They were marched out day after day, route marching through rain, slush and wet. The men were brought into camp, but had no opportunity to change their boots or to dry them; and the evidence is that there were no regimental cobblers in the fore part of the war and no dubbing or grease was provided to render the boots waterproof. These conditions all contributed to a more rapid deterioration of the boots than would otherwise have occurred.

Since the war broke out the department have made a very material alteration and improvement in the standard army boot. In the month of October they came to the conclusion that instead of a slip sole, as it is called, they would provide a through double sole and they stipulated in October that thereafter all boots manufactured for the department should have the through double sole. Under that provision some 40,000 boots have been manufactured with the through double sole. In addition to that they concluded that the soles should

be further reinforced by nails and that has been done. That is technically called quilting the soles. By these two changes a very substantial and beneficial improvement has been made in the character of the Canadian boot.

The committee were anxious to get a bird's-eye view, as it were, of what had taken place in Canada with respect to these boots. You may get an individual complaint here or there, you may get a complaint from a certain board of inquiry in a regiment where they have been using the boots under exceptional conditions, which might lead you at first to suppose that the boots were wrong. In Halifax, for instance, we find that in the earlier part of the training they were using these boots digging trenches in wet clay for seven weeks, and because the stitching gave way they came to the conclusion that all the boots were bad. That is not a fair test. Digging trenches in wet clay for seven weeks, we would expect that a boot would give way, especially when there was no regimental cobbler and no opportunity to dry the boots and no dubbing to grease them and only one pair of boots for each soldier. These are not fair illustrations of the general service that boots have to give. The proper way is to take a bird's-eye view of all worn boots in Canada, bring them together and see how they compare with the total number issued in the whole Dominion of Canada. The committee have done that. We asked the departmental officers to tell us, first of all, the number of boots that had been used by men in Canada who had not gone to England; then the number of boots discarded and not in use throughout Canada; and then we tried to find out how many of these boots could be repaired and, of those that could not be repaired, to find out the reasons for their unrepairable condition. We selected two practical men for this purpose. Of these men I shall have something to say hereafter. But first let me point out the manner in which condemned boots are placed before the Government. There is one way in which a soldier can get a new pair of boots, that is by getting his old ones condemned. At the beginning of the war there was only one way of getting a new pair, and that was through the medium of what are called regimental boards. The regimental boards were not only for regiments but sometimes for companies of a regiment, and in this way some 70 regimental boards have sat throughout Canada since the war began and have condemned boots. But it must be understood that in condemning boots these boards are simply adopting a process for getting new boots when boots were worn out by reasonable wear and tear, defects, or abuse on the part of the soldier himself. Let me read you upon that point from the evidence. Lieut. Col. Macdonald, the director of clothing and equipment in the department, who has been there a great number of years, in the inquiry swore:

By the Chairman:

Q. I suppose the real object of those boards of inquiry is to enable the minister to come to a conclusion, because he cannot do it himself personally—to come to a conclusion as to the state of boots reported on?—A. Yes.

Q. And those gentlemen get together, and get information from witnesses who are not sworn. And when the report of the Board of Inquiry comes I suppose you scarcely ever accept it without sending out your inspectors to see whether it is so or not?—A. In practically everything.

Q. You do not accept the recommendation at all?—A. No.

Q. As a matter of fact you regard them with suspicion?—A. I am afraid we do.

Q. Perhaps I should not say you regard them with suspicion, but you do not accept them as conclusive at all?—A. No.

Q. And for that reason you immediately send out inspectors?—A. We send out inspectors.

Q. You send for the boots and put the inspectors at work on them?—A. Yes.

Q. To see whether their condition justifies these reports?—A. Yes. Many of these officers who sit on the boards are men like myself who are not able to tell whether the boots sent up to them are the boots called for.

Q. And the fact that you put the inspectors to work on these boots shows that the report is not conclusive and was not intended to be so, but simply a gathering of what information you can get?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you have these boards of inquiry regularly?—A. Frequently.

Q. And the object of the inquiry was to see whether the men were justified in getting further boots?—A. Yes, justified.

Q. Or whether the boots being worn out was due to their own fault?—A. Yes.

Q. They have been more often rejected than acted upon?—A. Yes.

Q. Before the war they were more often rejected than accepted?—A. I would say so.

Q. They were more often rejected than accepted even before the war?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Murphy:

Q. What has been done since the war?—A. Since the war we have kept them there and had them re-examined.

Q. Kept them where?—A. At the different depots.

Q. Where the inquiry took place?—A. Yes, they are at all these various points; and if the inspector of leather finds that the fault was that of the maker of the boots, and sometimes they do so find, those boots were returned to the makers and they were replaced, or repaired and returned to us.

By Sir James Aikins:

Q. Those would be worn boots?—A. Yes, but if the fault lay, as it often happens, with the

wearer of the boots, that the sole is gone, that the inspector of leather who examines it very closely finds that the man has put it on a hot radiator and burnt it, the boot is returned, and the man has to pay for it.

I simply quote that to show that a condemned boot simply means a boot which the regimental board think they are justified in taking in and re-
12 noon. placing. I shall cite a few instances of these condemned boots at the various regimental district headquarters. At Toronto there had been issued until the 19th of March, 1914, 14,000 pairs of boots, of which 8,357 were issued before the new year and the balance after the new year. Of these only 413 pairs in all have been condemned, and of the 413 pairs 117 were repairable, leaving only 296 unrepairable out of 14,000, or about 2 per cent of the whole issue. No one can reasonably say that 14,000 boots were bad boots, if, out of that number, in the time they have been in use, from December until now, or until the 19th of March even, only 413 pairs have been condemned, and there are only 296 unrepairable altogether, or 2 per cent even of the whole issue.

At Kingston 2,400 pairs have been issued, and the whole of these are now in use, except 5 pairs which have been cut up for inspection purposes, and which, of course, could not be returned; so that 2,395 pairs are still in use out of the 2,400, although we got a report from Kingston that those boots were like moccasins and the soldiers could not wear them. Whether they were like moccasins or not I do not know, but the fact is that they are all in use, the whole 2,400, except 5 pairs; and the evidence is that they are giving good satisfaction to-day.

As regards Quebec, Colonel Landry said that of the 5,500 pairs issued to his men only 55 pairs had been condemned, and that all the 55 pairs had been repaired and reissued; so that the whole 5,500 pairs are in use to-day.

At St .Johns, Quebec, Lt.-Col. Sabourin said that there only 40 gave any dissatisfaction, and that 20 of these were due to misfits. I think he said that over 1,000 pairs had been issued, and that they had been used in all kinds of weather.

Let me give a resumé of all the boots that have come back. Excluding all the boots that have been sent to England and all those that are not yet issued, there are in Canada to-day 86,000 pairs of boots worn by the men in Canada. Of that 86,000 pairs, only 7,807 have been condemned; that is, out of the total 86,000 pairs the proportion

of boots that have for any reason been put out of work during that time is 9 per cent. What has become of the 9 per cent? Nearly 4 per cent, or 3,248, have already been reissued, leaving only 4,559 that are not reissued; that is only 5 per cent of the 86,000 have not been reissued. But that is not the whole story. That does not mean that the 5 per cent, or the 4,559, which have not yet been reissued are not repairable or serviceable; because the evidence, as I will show, indicates that the greater part of them are repairable.

In order to get a bird's eye view, we said: Bring to this committee all the condemned boots that are at the various regimental headquarters in Canada, and we will put two independent experts upon them. They sent us 1,713 inspections, of which 384 were singles and the balance pairs. The committee unanimously appointed two independent inspectors to go over those boots; one was J. A. Hoar, a customs shoemaker and cobbler, of Halifax, who had made boots for the military of the British Army and for the Navy, and who had had 30 years' experience as a cobbler and contractor. No one will say that his evidence was given in a biased manner. The other inspector was Mr. Magloire Côté, of the firm of J. A. & M. Côté, of St. Hyacinthe, who had been a manufacturer of shoes for 40 years and had no contract with the Government and had worked in every position in a shoe factory from the bench up to the position he occupies to-day. He also gave evidence in a very fair and satisfactory manner. These two men went away by themselves and made an examination of those 1,713 inspections. They reported on every single one, and collaborated in their report, the result, which was this: there were 1,713 inspections, of which 384 were singles. Out of these they found that 112 were burnt by the soldier himself and rendered useless on that account, and that 1,484 were repairable and should have been repaired. That left only 153 out of the 1,713, and they found that the unrepairable condition of 70 of these 153 was due to their being cut by toe nails, knife or spur. That left only 83 unrepairable. They also found that 68 had not originally been up to sample chiefly by reason of being too light in the backs. To summarize these figures, the total number issued to the men now in Canada is 86,000, and of these there have been condemned 4,557, which are now not in use. That leaves still in use 81,441 doing duty after six months' use. I am not saying by any means that the whole of

these have been used for the whole six months, because the department only started to issue to these men on the first of October, and they have been issuing from time to time since. But the whole of that 86,000 are now in use except 4,557; and of these 4,557, there are still repairable 3,351. If we accept the same basis of classification that was given to us by the two inspectors who were brought here to inspect the 1,713, which were part of the 7,807 condemned by the different boards, then the result as to the total number of condemned boots is that out of the 86,000 pairs there are only out of use to-day 1,208 which cannot be repaired, and which have been in use for varying periods from the 1st of October up to to-day. These 1,208 are accounted for as follows: 510 are not in use through being burned, and 319 by being mutilated by knife, spurs or nails, leaving only 379 out of the whole 86,000 that are not in use by reason of fair and reasonable wear and from other causes. Now there is no politics in figures like that. These two men were appointed unanimously, and I think the committee must acknowledge that they gave their evidence fairly. That is the result of the test given by these two practical men who were appointed to examine the boots that were condemned.

In the minority report I notice the following statement:

> That out of the said number of boots 265 pairs were not worth repairing.

While that is true, they forget to say that out of the 265, 112 were burnt and 70 were mutilated by knife, spur or nails that is, out of the 265, 182 were mutilated as I have said; that leaves only 83 which could be properly put in as the number of boots that were not worth repairing. So it was not fair to say that 265 pairs were not worth repairing without making this explanation. The minority report also says:

> If the proportion of boots in this particular lot, not equal to sample, is a fair percentage of the number of boots furnished that did not come up to samples, out of the one hundred and eighty thousand pairs supplied, the number of boots so furnished that were inferior to sample would be seven thousand, two hundred and ninety-eight boots;

Any one can see how unfair that is because there were 68 inferior boots in the 1,713 condemned boots, which are a part of the 7,807 condemned and therefore the worst part, and probably the only defective boots in the 86,000, and it is argued in the minority report that the same proportion existed in the original boots.

That is his argument. In other words, it is just the same as if he argued this: I sell to a man ten pairs of boots and after six months he comes back with two; of the two one is defective, one is fifty per cent of two and, therefore, fifty per cent of the whole ten are defective. I do not know which hon. member is responsible for it, but that is the argument and that is put in the minority report for the purpose of trying to show over 7,000 defective boots in the 86,000.

These figures show conclusively that the boot in Canada has stood the test well, especially under the trying circumstances of our winter, fall and spring. There is another consideration that must not be overlooked. The evidence proves conclusively that in the great majority of cases the number of boots supplied by the manufacturers of Canada to the Government was less than one per cent of their whole output. There was no case where the amount of a contract held by a manufacturer was more than five per cent of his output. Is it to be supposed, apart altogether from patriotic reasons, that any manufacturer would be so foolish as to supply the department with an inferior quality of boots when what he was selling the department represented such a small proportion of his annual output? I should think that, in his own interests, he would say: the boots I will supply to the department will be the greatest possible "ad" for me if they are good, and they will be the worst kind of a curse to my business if they are bad. The quantity supplied to the Government was such a small proportion of his annual output that it is only fair to conclude that in his own self interest he would give the department as good a boot as he could turn out. My hon. friends will not say, and do not say, that the boots manufactured were not up to sample, and they entirely exonerate the manufacturers. On the contrary, they will have to say upon the evidence that the boots manufactured were equal to the sample, and in many cases superior to it. That is the case with respect to the boots worn in Canada.

Now, a word or two as to the boots sent across the ocean. The conditions of Salisbury Plain were no fair test whatever for any army boot. All the witnesses who came before the committee, witnesses who had been on active service at Salisbury Plain, said that the conditions were most abnormal and exceptional. I propose to read

from the statements of witnesses who appeared before the committee and who had served at Salisbury to give us an idea of the conditions of weather there which these boots encountered.

Private Ross said:

(a) Private Ross, of the Queen's Own Rifles, who appeared before us, swore that he enlisted at Toronto, August 25th last, going to Valcartier. He sailed from Quebec on September 25th; that after reaching Salisbury Plains it rained for 35 consecutive days, and the camp grounds were wet and muddy during the whole time he remained there, namely, up to the 18th of February, 1915.

Mr. Bennett said:

(b) W. M. Bennett, of Walkerville, who was at Salisbury Plains once or twice a week between the 1st of November and the 16th of December, swore that the sun did not shine once while he was there; that it was constantly raining, and that it was nothing but a quagmire of mud around the tents; that during the whole time he was there it was not possible for a soldier to step out on the ground around his tent without getting his feet covered with mud, and that the roads were in an even worse condition, there being from 1 to 14 or 15 inches of a thick batter mud all over them.

I find on reading that over that I have not done justice to the conditions as described by Private Bennett, and I would like to read from the evidence itself:

Q. What time were you at Salisbury Plain?—A. I was there once or twice a week, each week between about the 1st November and 16th December.

Q. What were the conditions when you were there?—A. As regards what?

Q. As regards the weather.—A. Well, it could not possibly be worse.

Q. In what respect?—A. I never saw the sun shine once, it was usually raining. The mud was deeper and thicker than any place I ever saw in my life.

. . . . . .

By Mr. Chairman:

Q. Give us an idea of the mud conditions, what were they like?—A. Well, I can probably tell you that by saying, I think it was the greatest crime that Canadian troops were allowed to stay there.

Q. That does not answer my question.—A. I will describe it exactly then. At Bustard camp, where were located the 1st and 2nd Battalions, and possibly one or two others, the streets between the tents, the ground all around the tents, was nothing but a quagmire of mud. A man would step out of his tent and go down to about the top of his shoes in mud. It was that way every time I saw it. The roads were in even worse condition. There was anything from an inch to fourteen or fifteen inches of thick batter mud all over the roads. That is the description.

By Mr. Nesbitt:

Q. At Salisbury?—A. Well, not at Salisbury city. The Plain is 70 miles square. That is wherever the camps were.

Q. I saw some pictures in the Illustrated London News, showing water up to the step of the motors. Did you see anything like that where you were?—A. I have seen the water higher than that, where the motor could not go through.

Then Wm. T. Nussey, sergeant of he Princess Pats, who was located at Salisbury Plains until the 13th of January, swore that he had talked with those living at Ainsbury, Fulford Market, Lavington, and Salisbury, and they informed him it was the worst weather they had ever experienced in sixty years. These are the conditions, and the evidence shows that the English boot would not stand such conditions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend speaks of Salisbury Plains; will he give the evidence of Gen. Alderson?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Gen. Alderson did not give evidence, but I will deal with his message in a few minutes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I referred to his letter.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The conditions at Salisbury did not afford a test chance for any boots, but I am going to give you the test which the Canadian boot did stand under these exceptional and abnormal conditions:

Sergeant W. T. Nussey, above named, stated that he and his men were delivered 100 pairs at Valcartier and that up to the time he left Salisbury Plains in January, 1915, he had heard no complaints from his men respecting the boots; had worn his Canadian issue from Valcartier up to the time he appeared before the board, and was still wearing them, and left them with the Committee as an exhibit. They were in fair condition, the uppers intact, and he had worn them continually without repair until the 6th of March, when he had them half soled and the heels repaired; and when giving his evidence described them as,—as good a pair of boots as he ever had on his feet; had worn both the British and Canadian Army boot and preferred the Canadian boot, and that he had seen 12 years' service in the Imperial Army.

Private Ross, above named, swore: He had been issued his boots at Valcartier on the 30th of August, sailed for Salisbury on the 25th of September, was invalided home on the 18th of February, wore his boots during all this four months' time with the exception of two weeks during which time he wore a pair of British boots and had his own resoled, and the heels fixed with nails; that he discarded his British boots as he preferred the Canadian, and had been wearing his Canadian boots down to the 10th of March, seven months in all, that they were still in good shape with the exception of a few stitches in the back, and that he had never heard any of his companions complain about the Canadian boot, and that the English boot, which he wore for two weeks did not stand the water any better than the Canadian boot.

Corporal Edwards, mentioned above when he appeared before the board was wearing the

Canadian military boot which had been issued to him; he testified that he got them on the 5th day of October, after which he had gone to Salisbury Plains; that he had worn them ever since with the exception of a week which would be nearly six months he had worn them in all, and about two months ago he had had them half-soled; that they were still in good condition and be thought would last another three months; that before he had used the boots he had given them a good dubbin and had taken care of them ever since; that he had been wearing Canadian military boots for the last five years, and that he had not heard any complaints from the men at Salisbury Plains with respect to the boots.

Two pairs of British Army boots were produced before the board by Major General Hughes, and which he testified had been sent to him by Colonel Currie, commanding the 48th Highlanders, together with a letter from Colonel Currie stating that the boots had been in use for two weeks only; and, from an examination of these boots, we find that they have not stood the test as well as the Canadian boots worn by Nussey, Ross and Edwards.

The letter from our friend Col. J. A. Currie, of the 48th Highlanders, was addressed to Major General Hughes, and it reads:

North Larkhill, Salisbury Plain,
February 10, 1915.

Maj. Genl. S. Hughes,
Minister of Militia,
Ottawa.

Dear Gen. Hughes:

I understand there has been a great deal of talk in the paper about the issue of Canadian boots being very bad.

I do not agree with this as the great majority of Canadian boots issued to my men were good boots and of course bad boots are likely to crop up in the best lots.

A great stress has been laid on the fact that the English boot is superior. I am sending you by parcel post two pairs of Imperial boots issued two weeks ago to the men of my regiment.

Had the Canadian boots been nailed with small round headed nails such as are used in northern Ontario the boots would have worn much longer. I think there are still about 500 pairs of boots issued to my men at Long Branch still being worn and they are very comfortable on the feet and in dry weather will be much better than the English boot. My orderly room clerk has just been in and tells me he is wearing a pair of the boots issued to him at Long Branch and that he wears them in preference to the English boot, so the row raised over the boots has certainly lost Canada a good deal of business in boots and shoes we could have got and I do not think the cry raised was at all justified.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) J. A. Currie, Lt.-Col.

And I am glad to say that the men from my county are now in the trenches in France serving under Lt.-Col. Currie.

I may say that I am not contending that amongst the 180,000 boots furnished every boot was absolutely good and up to sample. It would be ridiculous to make any such contention, for there never has been and never will be 180,000 boots made without something being wrong with some of them, a few stitches slipped, a few nails missed or short, or something of that kind. Nobody would contend that every boot was perfect, but the finding of the committee is that the boots were manufactured substantially up to sample and in many cases superior thereto.

The boots for Col. Currie's men must have been issued to them at Long Branch in the months of September or October, and this letter is written in February; so that these boots had then been subjected to five months' wear at Salisbury Plain, under those abnormal and exceptional conditions, and Colonel Currie says that 500 of them—I understand there are about 1,000 men in his regiment—were still in use, which is certainly a very good test.

Only yesterday I received a letter which was of course not submitted to the committee, but I give it for what it is worth and without comment:

I quote from a letter received from my brother Corporal Wm. M. Waters who it at present serving with the first expeditionary force in France, and in the trenches:

"I can't see why all the papers are talking about our boots. The pair I got in Valcartier lasted till we left for France, and I'd rather have them now than the ones I have. They were lighter than these, but were a lot better."

I quote further from the proceedings before the committee the statement by a young soldier writing from Salisbury Plain:

Ninety per cent of the men here cannot wear the English make, and I am now wearing the Canadian boots. I am going to leave the English make behind and wear the ones from home, as they are more comfortable, though they might not possibly stand as much wear and tear.

In view of such evidence as this, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite what becomes of the great flaring headlines we have seen in the newspapers with respect to the fraudulent manufacture of these Canadian boots. I doubt if there ever was a class of citizens who have been so maligned as the Canadian boot manufacturers have been during the last two or three months. The result of this inquiry has been, and I am glad it has been so thorough, that we got before this committee all the permanent officials of the department, the boot inspectors, the Quartermaster General, the chief inspector of boots, the inspector of contracts, the assistant inspector of contracts, and we had also before us to give evidence all the manufacturers against whom any accusation in

respect to boots was made. In many cases we asked them to bring their invoices with them, and in other cases they brought their invoices voluntarily. They have produced the boots, they have shown whence the leather came, they have shown what leather they bought and what they paid for the leather, and those who have come before us have sworn that they manufactured the boots according to sample, and the committee is practically unanimous upon that point. The manufacturers who did not come before us did not come because they did not find there was any allegation made against them, and so the result of the whole inquiry is that the boots manufactured for the Canadian soldiers were up to sample.

What, then, becomes of the unjust allegations made from time to time by the press of Canada with respect to these boots? These allegations have been shown to be not only untrue, but they had the effect of injuring a great industry of the Dominion, and I understand they have prevented us from getting large contracts for boots from the allied nations of Europe. What becomes, for instance, of the headlines in the press respecting the man who told us that the bottom fell out of the soles of his boots after five days' wear? A man made that statement at one of these inquiry boards, and we brought him before the committee and we put him on the stand, and he told us at first that the bottom fell out of the soles of his boots, and as he was leaving the witness box he was asked how the barracks where he was billeted were heated, and his reply was that the barracks were heated by steam. He was then asked: "Did you leave the boots on the steam heater all night?" and his answer was, "No." Then when the question was put to him: "How many hours did you leave them on the steam heater during the night?" he replied: "Only four hours." Then, our boot expert examined the boot in question and testified that the man had burned his boots so badly that the soles fell out of them.

What becomes of the flaming headlines in the papers that the soles of some of these boots were filled with cork, cement, and glue? The man who made that statement came before the committee and said: I find I am wrong; I did not know that in the best Goodyear welt shoe made there is a substance called "fillo" which it is necessary to put into these boots, and I find that the specifications of the Department of Militia prepared by Charles E. Slater in 1905 for the late Government, required that this filling be placed in the very best Goodyear welt soles, and I did not know what I was talking about. And yet, notwithstanding that denial, the insinuation has gone throughout the length and breadth of Canada that the boot manufacturers of this country have been guilty of fraud in this respect.

What becomes of the allegations contained in flaring headlines in the newspapers of Canada that paper was used in the soles? I am not here to defend the manufacturers; I started out with the same prejudice against the manufacturers that the general public had before this investigation was held. There appeared in the Liberal press of this country, and in the Conservative press as well, flaring headlines placed before the people announcing that paper and other shoddy material had been found in the soles of these boots. Well, if paper had been found in the soles of these boots, hanging was not too good for the man who put the paper in. What I want to state here is that from the beginning of this investigation to the end, among all the boots that had been examined, among the 7,800 boots that had been condemned, and among all the boots that had been worn, no paper could be discovered in the soles. Among the many boots cut open by the Militia Board of Inquiry, and among the many boots cut open by the capable experts named by the committee, there has not been a single boot from beginning to end of this investigation as to which there was the slightest evidence that paper or any other fraudulent or shoddy material was put in the sole.

Then it was heralded throughout the country that a certain manufacturer had announced that when he looked at the boots provided for the Canadian soldiers he said he would not have it on his conscience to manufacture a boot like that and make money out of the lives of the soldiers. What became of him when he appeared before the committee? Let us see exactly what did happen when this gentleman did appear before us. It was shown clearly by the evidence that in 1913 Mr. Minister had tendered for boots for the department on the very same specifications, at $4.85 a pair; that in 1914, when he was given an opportunity to tender the same as the rest of the manufacturers, he said, "You have my price, and it is $4.85," and he was willing to tender again

if he got that price, and to make the boots for our soldiers. Here is his evidence to prove it:

Q. When the telegram came to you in 1914 asking you to tender on the shoes, you put in a tender, didn't you?—A. If you call that puting in a tender.

Q. You put in a figure of $4.85. You said you could manufacture them for that?—A. I don't think I put in any new price. I told them they had our price.

Q. Of $4.85?—A. Whatever it was.

Q. And you have already told us that that price was based on the specification in your possession. How else could you tender?—A. That price was based on the specification I received.

Q. You were willing to make a boot along the lines of the specification you had in your possession at $4.85?—A. I think so.

Q. No doubt about that at all in April?—A. Yes.

Q. And you were willing to make the same boot in August at the same price?

Mr. Macdonald: Witness explains that the situation was different when the war was on. Let him speak.

You will notice that it was Mr. Macdonald who was explaining that, not the witness.

By the Chairman:

Q. When you sent down your tender after the war was on—

Mr. Macdonald: The witness ought to be allowed to answer.

By the Chairman:

The Chairman: I am putting a question to him.

Mr. Macdonald: He was in the course of explaining when you interrupted.

By the Chairman:

Q. You put in a tender after the war was on, didn't you?—A. I would not consider that a tender.

Q. You offered to make the same boots after the war was on?—A. I said we could make so many boots, and they had our price.

Q. And that price was what?—A. $4.85.

Q. In other words, you meant that you could and would make boots for the department at $4.85 after the war was on?—A. Yes, I would—

Q. And it was on the specifications you had in your possession then that you made that offer?—A. So far as the material was concerned and workmanship.

Q. So far as the specifications were concerned?—A. Only that part of the specifications.

Q. So far as material and workmanship were concerned?—A. Yes.

Q. What else is there?—A. There is the shape.

Q. It was only a question of shape, then?—A. Principally, so far as the boot we were going to make.

By Sir James Aikins:

Q. I understand you objected to the form of the last that was adopted in respect to the new boots. I understand your main objection was to the shape of the boot?—A. That was the principal objection, and some other little things in the workmanship.

Q. What were the other little things?—A. I did not think they were reinforced properly.

Q. What do you mean by reinforced properly, do you mean the soles were not reinforced?—A. Yes.

Q. Reinforced with additional nails?—A. Additional nails, and a different kind of nails.

Q. Anything else?—A. I do not know of anything else.

This is the man who was willing to manufacture the same boots with a few additional nails in the heels if he could have obtained $4.85 for what the department were paying $3.65. This is what his partner, Major Myles, said when we brought him before the committee:

By Sir James Aikins:

Q. Have you ever been on active service?—A. I have not; I was called on the occasion of 1885 in the Northwest Rebellion.

Look at Exhibit 12—

Exhibit 12 is admittedly the boot from which all the army boots were made, except those that were submitted by the manufacturers to and approved by the department.

Q. Look at Exhibit 12; for the ordinary purposes to which you have been accustomed in Canada, do you think that would be a suitable boot; that is assuming that the size would fit a soldier?—A. For ordinary wear I think it would be.

Q. It is a good boot?—A. So far as I can see, till it is tested; I do not want to give an expression of opinion.

Q. On your own military experience.—A. We never had any boots issued to us by the department in our camps. The soldier had to wear his own boots. So far as I am concerned, the boot question never came up in my experience.

Q. So far as military boots are concerned, of the use of that as a military boot for campaign purposes you know nothing?—A. Nothing.

By Mr. Chairman:

Q. Do you remember your partner saying that before the war broke out at all your firm had in their possession the departmental specifications for a boot?—A. I saw the specification that came to us.

Q. You had them in your possession?—A. We had them in our possession.

Q. You had them in possession before the war broke out, and you put in a tender to build a boot for $4.85?—A. Yes.

Q. And if you had got the contract you would have made a boot before the war broke out for $4.85 on that specification?—A. Our signature is there.

Q. And you stand by your signature?—A. I stand by our signature.

Q. And after the war broke out you got an invitation to tender, and you sent back saying, you have our price?—A. Yes, "you have our price."

Q. And that was for the boot on the specification you had?—A. Yes.

Q. And if they had written back and said "all right, we will give you a contract for 10,000 pairs of boots" would you have stood by your signature and made the boots. Is that right?—A. Yes.

This is the man who was too conscientious to make boots for the Government

for $3.65, but would have made them for $4.85.

I think I can very well summarize the conclusions of this committee as follows, and in coming to these conclusions I am doing so on the evidence that has been adduced:

1. The standard military boot of the department when war was declared was the result of over fifteen years of careful consideration by that department, and after inspection of both the British and the United States military boot.

2. The present Canadian military boot is of the same class, but a much better boot than that issued to and worn by our men in the South African campaign, where it gave good satisfaction and was preferred to the British army boot, both of which were worn by our men there.

3. The boots supplied to the Militia Department since the war broke out were made according to the samples of said standard boot in the department, or according to samples submitted by the manufacturers to and approved by the department, and that they were in all cases equal and in many cases superior to said standard sample army boot of the department.

4. The United States Army Board after four years' deliberation adopted a standard army service boot which is similar in many respects to ours, but lighter.

5. The standard British army boot is not a suitable boot for adoption in Canada.

6. Out of 86,000 boots issued to and worn by the men now in Canada, all are now in use except 4,559, and of these about 3,351 are repairable and can be re-issued, leaving only 1,208 useless, and out of these again about 510 are useless owing to burning and 319 cut by knife, spurs or nails, leaving only 379 useless owing to ordinary wear and tear out of the 86,000; and this seems to prove that the boots have given good service in Canada through the worst part of the year, that is, the fall, winter and spring.

7. The exceptional and abnormal wet weather to which the boots were subjected at Salisbury Plain was not a fair test of the boots; no boots could resist the water under such conditions, and notwithstanding that the Canadian boots stood the test well, and the communications from General Alderson and Sir George Perley that the boots would not stand the rough wear and tear of Salisbury Plain must be read in the light of the abnormal and exceptional weather conditions that were encountered there, because no boot would stand such a test and remain impervious to water under such conditions.

8. Since the war broke out the department has very materially improved the standard boot by the requirement of a through double sole, and by re-inforcing or quilting the sole with nails.

9. A committee of experts and a special boot expert have been employed by the department with a view of ascertaining if any further improvement in the present standard army boot can be made, and that matter is still under consideration.

Mr. MARCIL: The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), before leaving the chamber, asked me to ask the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) not to overlook the question he put in regard to the statement made by General Alderson.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I did not overlook it, but I will say just a few words more. As I said, in the communications from General Alderson and Sir George Perley, the wording of their report, if I remember it rightly, is that the boots would not stand the rough wear and the wet weather to which they were subjected at Salisbury Plain, and that if they were unserviceable, it was on that account. What I say is, that in view of the evidence we have disclosed here, and in view of the evidence which we have gathered from outside quarters, such as that to which my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) referred, that is, the illustrations of Salisbury Plain in the Illustrated London News and other papers, and taking the only evidence we have before this committee—and I suppose it is upon that evidence we are bound to form our conclusions—of men who have been at Salisbury Plain, I have no doubt that conditions were most exceptional and abnormal; that like conditions have probably never been encountered before in the last twenty or thirty years there; that all the communications from the other side must be read in the light of those exceptional circumstances; that no boot would stand the conditions which were encountered there, and that therefore the boots supplied would not completely stand the conditions encountered there, nor the British boot either.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand the hon. member had a letter. If he has no objection, would he read it?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: It is printed in the proceedings.

At one o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker. In appointing a special committee of this House to investigate all matters relating to the boots that were supplied to the Canadian soldiers who enlisted for the present war, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) recognized the force of an aroused public opinion upon a subject which comes closely home to the Canadian people. His action at the time it was taken undoubtedly averted what was then a threatening storm; but, Sir, I venture to say that notwithstanding what was alleged by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) in his speech of this morning, when the facts adduced before the committee become generally known the storm will break, and the first to feel its effects will be the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues. By reason of the evidence submitted to us I am unable to concur in the report presented by my hon. friend from North Grey, and I propose to place before this House, as briefly as possible, the grounds upon which it should, in my judgment, decline to adopt that report.

Let me say a word as to the necessity of providing soldiers on active service with a suitable boot. That is an elementary principle to be observed in the equipping of any army. In this connection I cannot do better than give the House an extract from an article in the Liverpool Weekly Mercury of February 27, 1915:

> Good boots are of equal importance for the rank and file as brains are for the officers of an army. This is why such efforts have been made in various quarters to produce the best possible supply of army boots. The Duke of Wellington considered good boots as an item of the first importance in the soldiers outfit and when asked what he thought came next in importance replied: "A spare pair." "But what after that?" repeated his interviewer, "A spare pair of soles," said the Duke. Troops are useless if not mobile, it matters not how they can shoot if they are unable to reach the place where their shooting will take effect. It is therefore a sign of practical wisdom in those who instituted the marching and shooting competitions to combine them so as to make them inter-dependent. Marching power must be cultivated as well as marksmanship and the soldier may be inefficient from inferior boots just as easily as from an out of date rifle.

The opinions I have just quoted were confirmed by General Lessard and by every officer who appeared before the committee. In fact, Sir, the only persons who appear to have failed to grasp such an elementary principle are the members of this Government; and the consequences of their failure to do so were placed before the committee in a manner to which I intend to direct the attention of the House a little later on.

Before dealing with the contracts that were awarded after the war began, or with the boots that were supplied under those contracts, let me draw attention to certain facts which have an important bearing on the inquiry that the committee was directed to make. To do this it will be necessary to go back a few years; but for the moment I will not go further back than the year 1905. On the 9th of May, 1905, an ankle boot made by the Slater Shoe Company, of Montreal, was adopted by the Department of Militia and Defence as their sealed pattern to be used in future contracts. This sealed pattern was not designed as an active service boot, nor was it the boot that was used by the Canadian soldiers in South Africa, the hon. member for North Grey to the contrary notwithstanding. It was a boot suitable for soldiers in time of peace, and did not materially differ from the ordinary walking boot used by civilians in Canada. After 1905 some slight modifications were made in the boot, and the boot so modified was sealed by the officials of the Militia Department as their sealed pattern on January 15, 1911. The Slater Shoe Company of Montreal continued to supply boots according to this sealed pattern until after the change of Government in 1911. Then, in the year 1913, the L. Gauthier Company, of Quebec, became the principal contractors with the Department of Militia and Defence, and in that year they supplied 8,000 pairs of boots to the department. Some of these boots were in the ordnance stores when war broke out in August last, and when arrangements were made to purchase the first lot of 65,000 pairs of boots, no specifications were furnished the contractors, but several of these Gauthier boots were selected as being in every respect similar to the sealed pattern, and were sent to the contractors as samples of the boots they were to manufacture. During the inquiry it was shown that the Gauthier samples sent out to the manufacturers were inferior to the Slater sealed pattern, and the latter, I wish the House to observe, is the boot which was adopted during the regime of the late Government. On the point of the Gauthier samples that were sent out to the manufacturers in August last being inferior to the sealed pattern that was in the department, Mr. N. Tetreault was examined and gave evidence to this effect, that in the upper the leather in the Gauthier sample was lighter than the leather in the Slater sealed pat-

tern, the stock being one and six-tenths in the sample and two and four-tenths in the sealed pattern, while in the vamps there was the same proportionate difference between the two as to weight and thickness. As to the slugs in the heels, in the sample, zinc slugs were used and in the sealed pattern steel slugs were used, and there was an additional half-row of these steel slugs in the pattern. Mr. Tetreault's evidence on this point will be found on pages 1101 and 1102 of the printed proceedings of the committee. That evidence clearly establishes the fact that, even if the contractors had made boots in all respects similar or equal to the samples furnished them, their boots would have been inferior to the sealed pattern, which, as I have said, was not intended for an active service boot. It was under these conditions that the first order for 65,000 pairs of boots was given in August last. Then, in September, the second order for 32,867 pairs was given. Of these boots some were made from the inferior samples sent out by the department, and others from samples furnished by the contractors themselves. In cases in which the contractors furnished the samples, we had evidence from several of them to the effect that the samples they furnished were equal to or better than the inferior Gauthier sample. On October 8, 9 and 10 further orders were given for 30,000 pairs under conditions similar to those that governed the September order. On October 24, the Department of Militia and Defence made a change in the sample boot by doing away with the slip sole, that is, the sole between the inner and the outer sole and extending from the toe to the ball of the foot.

In the place of this slip sole the department provided for a double sole running through to the back of the heel, and by reason of this change the price was increased from $3.85 to $4 a pair. Between October 29 and November 4, the department ordered 40,532 pairs of these double-soled boots, which were made in the same manner as the boots ordered in September, namely, some according to the departmental sample, and others according to samples furnished by the contractors themselves. In the month of November, under instructions from the acting Minister of Militia to purchase boots locally in Winnipeg the senior ordnance officer in that city bought 3,798 pairs of boots from middlemen. These middlemen had the boots manufactured in different factories in Ontario and Quebec, at prices ranging from $3.40 to $3.60 per pair, while they charged the Government an average price of $4 per pair. Afterwards, several other orders were placed in different parts of Canada, and in all the department purchased, as the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) has already told the House, 180,664 pairs of boots.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the $4 which the hon. member quotes as the price at Winnipeg include freight to that point?

Mr. MURPHY: I do not propose to go into those details; I am just giving the details as we got them before the committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is very important.

Mr. MURPHY: I was about to say that having stated the manner in which purchases were made, it is important to see what arrangements were provided by the Government for the inspection of these boots. Up to the end of the year 1911, the inspector of boots in the Department of Militia and Defence was a practical boot and shoemaker. That gentleman was dismissed without cause in December, 1911, and in his place was appointed another gentleman who had had no experience as a boot maker or as a tanner, and whose business immediately prior to entering the department had, according to himself, been that of a broker. He had been in the department prior to the change of Government.

Major General HUGHES: What was the name of the man dismissed?

Mr. MURPHY: Edward Wallace.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Who was appointed in his place?

Mr. MURPHY: Colonel Brown.

Major General HUGHES: Does the hon. gentleman say that when Wallace was dismissed Col. Brown was appointed? Col. Brown has been there for years and years and years.

Mr. MURPHY: If the hon. gentleman wants to make a speech—

Major General HUGHES: I am asking a question.

Mr. MURPHY: I am stating facts and I object to being interrupted. This is the House of Commons, and I appeal for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Major General HUGHES: If the hon. gentleman objects to a question—

Mr. MURPHY: I do not object to any proper question, but I object to having my

speech broken up. I had stated that Col. Brown was in the department prior to the change of Government before my hon. friend asked his question.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In what position?

Mr. MURPHY: Inspector of harness and saddlery.

Major General HUGHES: And boots.

Mr. MURPHY: No, not of boots. He never made a boot in his life, nor was he a tanner either.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not suppose he ever made a saddle or harness either.

Mr. MURPHY: Still, he is there yet. In August last, when the first contracts were given, five other boot inspectors were employed, and of these only three had had experience as boot and shoe makers. It was admitted by all the witnesses who had had any practical experience that the only way in which boots could be properly inspected was to follow them through the various processes of manufacture in the factory. The inspection in the factories was carried out only in a limited number of cases, and most of the inspecting done was by making a superficial examination of the finished boot. It is important also to mention that all the inspectors used the same stamp, so that it was absolutely impossible to identify the inspector of any particular lot of boots. In the case of the first order given in August last, 13,926 pairs of boots were delivered at Valcartier without any inspection whatever, and I am convinced that there was no inspection of the boots purchased at Winnipeg or Vancouver. On the whole, therefore, the department was not equipped to do the inspection, and as a matter of fact that work was not properly done.

Let me now refer the House to some evidence that was given with reference to the sample boot, and the boots made from the sample and afterwards issued to the soldiers. First, as to the sample boot. Speaking generally, that boot was condemned as an active service boot by every witness who appeared before us. Prior to the appointment of this special committee of the House, the Department of Militia and Defence had appointed a departmental committee in the month of December last to investigate the complaints with regard to these boots, which even then had reached considerable proportions. That committee was composed of Lt.-Col. Hallick, E. A. Stephens, and Theo. Gallipeau. When speaking this morning, my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) took exception to the competency of the members of that departmental board, and found fault with us for quoting in our minority report some of the opinions expressed by members of that board with reference to the matters in regard to which they conducted their inquiry. In this connection I have only to point out to my hon. friend that we quoted merely the opinions of those members, but we were careful to add that the witnesses who appeared before that committee appeared afterwards before the special Committee of this House, and confirmed under oath the opinions that had been expressed before the departmental board. On page 597 of the Votes and Proceedings of Friday last, the 9th of April, there is a summary of the opinions of the departmental board with regard to the character of the boot prescribed and supplied by the department. That summary is as follows:

> That the boot was of unsuitable shape and make and that the leather contained no water-resisting medium;
>
> That the heels and soles are unprotected and sole-filling is often poor quality;
>
> That the boot was unsuitable for the soldiers and for the particular work for which they were provided; because,—
>
> (a) The shape is such that the average foot has not room for the free movement of the toes and is thus not suitable for marching;
>
> (b) The leather is dry, containing no grease, and consequently quickly absorbs the water;
>
> (c) Soles and heels not being re-inforced with metal, soon wear down, especially when wet.

And the comment made in reference to that by my colleagues and myself who composed the minority on the committee was that we were of opinion that these findings of the departmental board, expressed by them it is true merely as opinions, had been amply proved by the evidence submitted to us.

Then, Sir, this sample boot was condemned as an active service boot by every manufacturer who appeared before us. Mr. Tetreault, for instance, said that it was ridiculous to put such a boot on a soldier; and Mr. Matthews, the gentleman who evolved the ingenious theory that the boots supplied to the soldiers were not supplied for the purpose of being used on active service, but merely to break in the feet of the soldiers so as to accustom them to a heavier boot when they got on active service, condemned this sample boot as unfit for active service. Similar evidence was given by Mr.

Adams, of the Murray Company, and by Mr. William Silver, one of the gentlemen recently appointed as a boot inspector in the department, who stated that everybody acknowledged that the boot was too light for the service to which it was put.

Now, a few words as to the judgment passed upon the boots, made from this sample boot and issued to the soldiers. The first condemnation of the boots to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is that contained in the cablegram from General Alderson, dated the 19th November, 1914, and sent to the Government at Ottawa. That cablegram will be found at page 245 of the printed proceedings and is in these terms:

The boots now being issued to the contingent are not suitable for rough wear in wet weather. Please cable instructions for purchase of boots here if we can obtain them.

Instead of answering the request made by General Alderson, some brilliant genius at Ottawa conceived the idea of sending over 48,000 pairs of overshoes, and this cablegram was sent to General Alderson:

Reference your cable re boots. Forty-eight thousand pairs overshoes already shipped. Will this meet your requirements?

To which General Alderson replied on the 25th November:

It has been found that overshoes do not compensate for faulty construction of boots. Some pairs are useless after ten days' wear. Special report is being made.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is from the commander of the Canadian forces?

Mr. MURPHY: These cablegrams are from the general commanding the Canadian forces. These cablegrams are followed on November 24, 1914, by a cable from a colleague of my right hon. friend (Sir George Perley), who is at present acting as High Commissioner in London. On the 24th November, 1914, Sir George Perley cabled to the Prime Minister at Ottawa in these terms, and this cablegram will be found at page 247 of the printed proceedings:

"Confidential. Much difficulty obtaining orders Canadian boots. Authorities consider them too light altogether; say only heavy marching boots adapted to campaigning; find general complaint on this account regarding boots given our Canadian contingent; stated they will not stand mud and water and heavy work. Consider overshoes impracticable, as they are heavy to walk in and will only last short time on hard roads. In my opinion next contingent should be provided with boots made on regulation army pattern.

"(Sgd.) PERLEY."

There, Mr. Speaker, we have the proof of the condemnation of the boots supplied the first Canadian contingent by the general in command of that expeditionary force, and by Sir George Perley, acting High Commissioner in London. But that is only a very small fraction of the condemnation of these boots. There were more than seventy regimental boards of inquiry held in England and in Canada in regard to the quality of the boots issued to the soldiers. In every case these boards condemned the boots that were brought before them, and all of the reports of the boards were sent to headquarters in Ottawa. It is not my intention to cumber the record of the House with copious extracts from these reports; but I do intend to direct your attention and that of the House to the evidence that was given by individual soldiers who appeared before these regimental boards and who later on appeared before the special committee of the House and gave evidence under oath.

First of all, let me quote the evidence given by Private McGarvie which will be found at page 557 of the printed proceedings:

By Mr. Pringle:

Q. What regiment are you connected with?—A. 6th Field Ambulance.

Q. You examined some boots for a Board of Inquiry which sat in Montreal on 22nd December, 1914?—A. Yes, sir.

. . . . . .

Q. Where had you your experience in respect to leather?—A. Maybole, Ayrshire, Scotland.

Q. What was your experience?—A. I have had experience since I was a boy of fourteen years of age.

Q. What doing?—A In the shoemaking business.

Q. Were you apprenticed there?—A. I served eight years in the shoemaking business for a start; that is, clicking; I was a shoe clicker.

Q. I do not understand?—A. An upper cutter.

Q. How long were you at that business?—A. I had to serve eight years before I was a journeyman.

Q. What kind of leather were you accustomed to; what tannage?—A. Split, kip, box calf, greasy kid, anything at all.

Then, at page 558 the same witness gives this further evidence:

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q Did you ever work at the boot trade in Canada, McGarvie?—A. No, sir, I am only acting as regimental shoemaker for that Company now.

Q. How long have you been in this country?—A. For three years.

Q. You were mobilized with the corps last fall?—A. I have been five months with the corps now, sir.

Q. And your rank is that of private, is it?—A. Private, sir.

Q. When were you made regimental shoemaker?—A. About a month ago.

Q. You have been repairing bad boots since that?—A. Not exactly repairing them. I have been stripping them to see what really could be done with some of the boots lying down there,

and I found in the heels alone, when trying to peel off the heel top, it ought to come off direct, but in place of that it came off in small pieces, it was just like a sponge in the center. It just tore off like you would tear a piece of pasteboard.

Q. What other defect did you find dealing with the boots there?—A. I would say the uppers are too light.

Q. Too light?—A. Yes, for military wear the uppers are too light.

By Hon. Mr. Murphy:

Q. Is that the whole boot you are referring to?—A. Yes, I say the whole boot is too light.

At page 560 the same witness is further examined:

By the Chairman:

Q. The uppers are right, are they not?—A. The uppers look all right, they may suit a civilian, but they are not suited to a military man, and the usage he puts them to. They are all right for Sunday.

Q. Did you serve in any military force before you came to Canada?—A Yes, I was seven years in the Royal Scots Fusiliers.

There you have the evidence of a man who speaks from his experience, both as an Imperial soldier and as a practical boot and shoe maker.

Next, let me refer you to the evidence given by Quartermaster Sergeant Wainwright, which will be found at page 410 of the printed proceedings.

By Mr. Pringle:

Q. What is your official position?—A Quartermaster Sergeant.

Q. I see that at a Board of Officers assembled at the headquarters of the 31st Battalion, Victoria Park, Calgary, on the 8th December, 1914, you made certain statements, You said:—

> "That he finds the boots generally as received by him into stores are unfit to stand the hardships of a campaign, owing to the uppers being made of split leather, differing from the British Army contracts, which call for 'kip' uppers. Of the boots received, those of McPherson, Hartt, and Murray, these three names being separate companies, appear to be the better makes of those received, but even these will not last the length of time they should under present climatic conditions. Those marked 'McCready' appear to be very light and flimsy."

What have you to say with regard to that?—A. Well, sir, the boots were not fit for soldiers.

Q. Was it on account of the climate that you consider the boots were too light?—A. No, I say the boot was too light and flimsy for the hardships they had to undergo.

Q. How many pairs of boots did you examine?—A. I think something like sixty-three pairs.

Q. Who was the manufacturer?—A. Well, the biggest percentage was made by Gauthier and McCready.

The same witness was further examined, and I quote from his evidence, page 412:

Q. Out of 1,093 boots you do not think there were a dozen as good as the sample, that is in your opinion?—A. That is my opinion. I would not think I had a dozen pairs of boots as good as that boot there.

Further evidence was given by this witness, in answer to questions put by Mr. Macdonald, at page 414:

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. What is your military experience?—A. I served twelve years in the Imperial army, sir.

Q. Before coming to this country?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Consequently you know what a proper military boot is?—A. I do, sir. I have served all over the world, practically speaking.

Q. Your emphatic condemnation of these boots is made on your experience as an English soldier?—A. Yes, sir.

There again you have these boots, supplied by the Government of Canada to the Canadian soldiers, condemned by a man who has seen service for many years in the Imperial army.

The next evidence from which I wish to quote is that of Major F. W. Doane, and at page 329 of his evidence this appears:

By Mr. Pringle:

Q. You are connected with the 63rd Regiment, I think?—A. Yes, sir, Major and Quartermaster.

Q. I notice that on 29th September, 1914, you had an examination of boots issued to the men of "A" Company?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you tell us what condition those boots were in?—A. Speaking generally, the boots were badly worn.

Q. Was there any defect in the workmanship of the boot?—A. The stitching was bad.

Q. Was that bad stitching in the soles or in the uppers?—A. In the soles.

Mr. Pringle: I happen to have looked at some of those Halifax boots, and as you say, they are certainly very badly worn—the soles are practically worn off some of them.

Further on, at page 331, I quote from Major Doane's evidence again:

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. This inquiry was held on the 29th September, and the boots were issued on the 10th August. Tell us what was the condition of the boots at that time?—A. After about a fortnight the boots were worn through so that the men's feet were on the ground. They had to tie shingles and bits of board and pieces of bag across the bottoms of their boots to keep their feet off the ground.

By Hon. Mr. Murphy:

Q. Do you mean to say they went around in that way, with pieces of shingle and board tied to their boots?—A. Yes, sir, they had to.

By Mr. Pringle:

Q. Had you not any cobblers attached to your regiment?—A. We had one, but we had not any material, and these boots could not be repaired.

Q. They had gone too far?—A. Yes.

Mr. RAINVILLE: Read the next page, please.

Mr. MURPHY: I will leave that for my hon. friend to read; I cannot burden the record with all the evidence.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Nor with any evidence that is not favourable to you.

Mr. MURPHY: It is open to my hon. friends to read that evidence. In connection with these boards of inquiry that were held at Halifax there was called Captain C. A. Mumford, and at page 373 of the evidence the following appears in his testimony:

By Mr. Pringle:

Q. I see, Captain Mumford, that you were president of a board for the examination of boots, held on the 29th September, 1914, at McNab's Island?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The other members of the board appear to be W. E. Doane, Lieutenant, and C. N. Bennett, Lieutenant?—A. Yes, sir.

At page 374 of Captain Mumford's evidence I quote:

Your finding was: (reads)

"The board having examined the boots are of opinion that they have become unfit for further use and that they should be replaced and the cost charged to the public."

The witness was further examined, and at page 377 the following questions and answers appear:

Q. Was the health of your men affected by reason of these boots?—A. Yes. In fact I had three tubercular men put into the hospital out of that lot. I think they all contracted heavy colds.

Q. Three of your men that were tubercular have been—A. Put out of the regiment.

Q. By reason of the colds they contracted?—A. Yes.

Q. They have since been put out of the regiment?—A. Put out of the regiment.

Q. Where are they now?—A. At their homes.

Q. Where?—A. At Halifax.

Q. What are their names?—A. One was Sutherland, another Hefferman, I just forget the other. I am not captain of our company now.

Another witness from Halifax who appeared before the committee was Captain F. C. Kaizer, and I quote from his evidence at page 367:

By Mr. Pringle:

Q. I see, Captain Kaizer, that you were president of a board of officers assembled at McNab's Island, Halifax, N.S., on the 29th September, 1914, by order of Lieut.-Colonel T. W. Viditi, for the purpose of examining boots issued to the men of "A" Company and reporting on the condition thereof. The other members of your board were Lieut. W. M. Rogers and Lieutenant R. C. Macdonald. Now, you took evidence, I see, from Major F. W. W. Doane?—A. Yes, sir.

Further on, Captain Kaizer deposed:

Q. In what condition were the boots in on the 29th September, when you held this inquiry?—A. They were practically all gone; the uppers were left.

At page 371 the following evidence from Captain Kaizer is reported:

[Mr. Murphy.]

Q. How far is McNab's Island from the city?—A. It takes about an hour to go down on the duty boat, but it goes in a roundabout way and makes a lot of calls. Maybe in a straight line it would be a little over two or two and a half miles.

Q. Was the health of the men affected by the state of their boots?—A. Yes. They all got colds.

Q. You say they all got colds?—A. Yes. We found it was very difficult to do anything with the men; we had to favour them all we could because of that.

Q. You heard the evidence that some of the men had to tie their boots with some material to protect their feet. What was that?—A. Canvas and bags principally. In my company there were three or four men who used that.

Q. They tied canvas bags to the soles of their boots?—A. Yes.

Q. To prevent their feet coming out on the ground?—A. Yes.

Q. How many men had to go around in that condition?—A. About three.

Q. For how long?—A. Two of them bought boots for themselves, and the other one used rubber boots for about perhaps a week or ten days, whenever it was wet. He used to use the rubber boots for night duty.

Q. How long would you say these three men went around with bags tied to the soles of their boots?—A. Oh, probably a week or ten days.

I quote from the bottom of page 372 and the top of page 373 from the evidence of Capt. Kaizer:

By Hon. Mr. Murphy:

Q. You said it was a common occurrence to see some of these men wearing bags on their feet. They went up and down and were seen on the duty boat?—A. Yes.

Q. Were these men going to Halifax?—A. I presume so, or maybe to some other port of call that the duty boat goes to.

Q. So that anybody that had eyes could see?—A. Could see.

Q. Could see what these men were wearing and the condition in which their feet were?—A. Exactly.

Q. And you know of no action being taken to remedy that by anybody in authority?—A. I do not know of any action having been taken. As I say, that is something that is outside of my sphere altogether.

Q. At any rate, you do not know of any action?—A. I do not know of any action.

These regimental boards of inquiry were held throughout Canada and in England and as late as the first of the present month of April, a board sat in the city of Ottawa, and I shall acquaint the House with the condition of certain military boots here in Ottawa on the first day of this very month.

Lieut. Anderson was called, and his evidence, which will be found at page 1189, is as follows:

By Mr. Pringle:

Q. I see you were a member of a Board of Officers which sat at Ottawa on the 1st day of April, 1915, by order of Lt.-Col. E. C. Arnoldi, 10th Artillery, for the purpose of inspecting the boots issued 25th Battery and Ammunition

Column 7th Artillery. The board consisted of Captain W. Harty. He is absent, is he not?—A. He is on leave.

Q. The other members were Captain J. S. McParland and yourself?—A. Yes.

Q. You say you had to deal with nine pairs of boots. Of these, five pairs were worn through at the toe. In the case of one pair the heel was rotten and fell off in a week. Two pairs, the soles wore off. One pair warped so badly as to be unwearable in spite of being properly greased. Do you know when these boots were first issued to your battery?—A. We got orders to recruit on the 1st of March. The official order was given on the 5th or 6th, I think.

Q. Where did you mobilize?—A. In Ottawa here at the drill hall. We are still at the drill hall.

Q. You mean at the armouries?—A. At the armouries. The first week recruiting was fairly good, and after we had 100 or 150 men we started issuing clothing and boots.

Then, on page 1190:

By Mr. Pringle:

Q. How many pairs were issued altogether?—A. 279.

Q Out of the 279 pairs, you have only had complaints in regard to these nine pairs?—A. No, sir; I had a man this morning and his boot hurt him so—it was worn right through to his foot. The boot getting wet, had shrunk. I have had a great many complaints. The doctor told me this morning that that man could not walk that he could not wear the boots. They were at least one size too big for him.

Q. Out of 279 pairs, in regard to how many have you had complaints?—A. 25 or 30 pairs, probably more.

There you have proof that even down to the present month of April these boots have continued to be condemned by regimental boards, and no excuse as to weather conditions can be offered by even the most partisan supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite for the failure of these boots which were issued to this local battery and which wore out under the most favourable weather conditions in Ottawa in less than three weeks' time. I could cite a great many other cases of the same character, but it is not my intention to take up the time of the House in so doing. I submit that the cases I have already cited are amply sufficient to show the failure of the boots supplied by the Government under the various orders placed in August last and in the succeeding months.

In view of the conditions disclosed by the evidence before the committee, it will naturally be asked: What did the Government do to provide a remedy? So far as results are concerned, the Government has done absolutely nothing. From certain official files produced before the committee, we learned that in the month of December last there was some cabling to England and certain correspondence intimating an intention on the part of the Government to adopt the British boot as a pattern for the Canadian military boot, but nothing was done. In the month of January, when this matter continued increasingly to attract public attention, there was a rather important series of developments at Ottawa. At that time, if my information is correct, the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence was either absent from Ottawa, or, if not, some of the matters relating to his department were being looked after by a subcommittee of the Privy Council. In that month the boot manufacturers got together and decided they would send a committee to Ottawa to make representations as to a boot that should be substituted for the boot issued to the Canadian soldiers. Accordingly about the middle of January a committee of boot manufacturers, consisting of Mr. George A. Slater, of Montreal, Mr. N. Tétreault, of Montreal, and Mr. W. R. Louson, of Ames-Holden-McCready Company, Limited, came to Ottawa with a specially prepared boot; and, as I recall the evidence, a draft of a new specification. They first interviewed the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir. George Foster) on the subject, and were by him referred to the right hon. the Prime Minister, by whom they were again referred to a subcommittee of the Privy Council that was dealing with war contracts; and later on they secured an audience in the Privy Council Chamber with the subcommittee which they stated was presided over by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). They made representations to this subcommittee as to the inefficiency of the boots that had been supplied, and they produced a new boot which in their opinion should be substituted for the ones being worn by the Canadian soldiers. It appears that the subcommittee of the Privy Council was so impressed by the representations made that it appointed a special committee of boot men to go into the matter presented for its consideration, that special boot committee being composed of Mr. George A. Slater of Montreal, Mr. E. E. Donovan of the E. T. Wright Company of St. Thomas, Ontario, Mr. E. A. Stephens of Ottawa, and Lt.-Colonel Brown, Inspector in the Department of Militia and Defence. These gentlemen conferred together, and about the 20th of January they submitted their report to another meeting of this subcommittee of the Privy Council. In effect, they recommended the boot which had been prepared

by the boot manufacturers, and they also presented a specification to govern the manufacture of that boot. As told to our committee, they were very courteously received by the subcommittee of the Privy Council which examined their boot, read over the specification and then asked them to retire while the subcommittee conferred about the matter. Later on they were brought back to the Privy Council Chamber and were informed by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who at that time was Acting Minister of Militia and Defence, that the subcommittee had decided to adopt the boot submitted by this boot committee as well as the specification that they had prepared, and that 110,000 pairs of these new boots would be ordered. Up to that point it appeared as if business would be done; but the House will probably be surprised to learn that afterwards nothing was done.

The next step of which we had knowledge in the committee was that on February 18, 1915, two days after the special committee of this House began its work, an Order in Council was passed appointing Mr. S. R. Wickett, a tanner of Toronto, as chief adviser on boots. It is true that Mr. Wickett stated before the committee that he had received instructions from the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence to begin work in January, but he took no part in the proceedings before the subcommittee of the Privy Council, and there is no official record of his appointment until the Order in Council of February 18, 1915, which was based on a report to Council of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence to the effect that Mr. Wickett had extensive experience in the manufacture of footwear, and that he was therefore the best available expert to advise the Government on the subject.

However, when Mr. Wickett was examined under oath he told us very frankly that he had never made a boot in his life; that he was a tanner. Now, Mr. Wickett, who is a most respectable gentleman, was one of the last witnesses examined before our committee, and he informed the committee on the last day he was there in the capacity of a witness, that he had not yet made a report as to the type of boot that he would recommend, and he was not quite certain when he would make such a report. That brings us down to the present month of April. What are the conditions at the present time? According to Colonel J. F. Macdonald, the director of clothing and Equipment, there are at headquarters in Ottawa requisitions for about 20,000 pairs of boots; and that gentleman swore that there were less than 1,000 pairs of boots in stock to meet these requisitions. So, it may fairly be stated that the Government's record for inaction at the present time stands thus: They cancelled no contracts that they had awarded; on the contrary, they allowed the contractors to go on and supply boots that were generally condemned as unfit for active service; and some of these boots were delivered as late as last month: they have continued to send troops to England since November 24 last, with the same boots as were condemned by General Alderson and Sir George Perley; they have made no attempt to outfit any of the troops with boots suitable for active service; and finally, according to the director of clothing and equipment, there are requisitions in for nearly 20,000 pairs of boots which they are not able to fill.

That being the state of affairs at the present time, what was the nature of the defence put up by the majority of the special committee in their report? First of all, in excuse for the failure of the boots, we are told that the boots were issued at a bad time of the year—that there was snow and slush. But these gentlemen failed to tell the House and the country that the first issue of boots had been condemned by the General Commanding the Overseas Expeditionary Forces and that they had been rejected and replaced by the British army boot. Then they failed to tell the House and the country, so far as the boots worn in Canada were concerned, that the soldiers in nearly all places, if not in all, where severe weather prevailed, were furnished with overshoes, and in some cases with rubbers. But they say, by way of excuse to the House for the haste in which some of the boots were produced: There was the retreat from Mons. Well, of all the fantastic reasons to excuse the failure of the Government, this is the most fantastic. I waited to hear the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) repeat in his speech that excuse which appears in the report of the majority; but I noticed that he did not repeat it, and I think that upon reflection he will not do so. It has been said that the comic is never very far from the tragic; and the dragging in of the retreat from Mons as an excuse for the bad boots furnished the Canadian soldiers illustrates the truth of that saying. My hon. friend says that the boot issued to the Canadian soldiers in this war

4 p.m.

is the same as was issued to the troops in the South African war. I have already made the statement that that was not the case, and I intend to prove that that was not the case. Let me refer you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, to the evidence given by Assistant-director of Stores McCann, which will be found at page 1033. After Mr. Pringle, the Government counsel, had put in a report dated 9th of May, 1905, showing that on that date a sample boot made by the Slater Shoe Company had been sealed as the pattern boot, the following evidence was given:

Q. We have got a pattern sealed on 9th May, 1905.—A. Yes.

Q. Is that the sealed pattern that has been carried down to the present date?—A. Practically.

Q. Practically the same?—A. There are some slight differences I expect; I do not like to give a definite answer.

Q. Probably Colonel Brown could speak as to the pattern. There have been some slight changes, but you say it is practically the same as the sealed sample?

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. From 1905?—A. Yes.

Q. Then it does not date back to the South African war?—A. No.

Again, turning to page 1034, where the same witness gives this further evidence:

Q. Do you remember who were the contractors for the boots used in the South African war?—A. So far as my recollection goes, the Vankleek Hill Shoe Co. and A. W. Reddin.

Q. When did the Slater Shoe Co. begin to supply boots?—A. I think they began to supply a different pattern of boot probably about 1905. They were long boots, a winter boot, a knee boot for the cavalrymen, what is called Wellington boot, with a little low leg. I cannot recall the Slater Shoe Co. having made ankle boots until probably 1902-03.

Q. That would be the time that Canada assumed control of her own defence on land, and the quantity of boots required would be greater.—A. Possibly, sir.

Q. The 1905 sealed pattern was altogether a different pattern boot from the one used in the South African War?—A. So far as I can recollect, it was, except this, if I remember rightly. A number of the men who went to South Africa bought their own boots. Slater boots, with their own money. Of course, there were not a great many men who went to South Africa. The men of the Strathcona Horse wore those long boots.

Q. They were outfitted by Lord Strathcona?—A. Yes. I think they were. I think they got their boots from the Slater Shoe Co.

Then, Sir, let me direct attention to the further evidence given by the same witness, at page 1057:

By the Chairman:

Q. Are you able to answer our question as to when the first Slater shoes, ankle boots, were made for the Militia Department?—A. Some time in the latter part of 1900. I think it was September, 1900.

Q. That will be after the troops had gone to South Africa?—A. Yes, sir.

By Hon. Mr. Murphy:

Q. Was that when the boots were bought and paid for?—A. They were ordered in September, 1900.

By the Chairman:

Q. There is no doubt then that none of the Slater boots, ankle, were supplied to the soldiers who went to South Africa?—A. If they were they were not paid for. They were not, I am quite sure.

By Hon. Mr. Murphy:

Q. Then how did other officials come to tell us they were the Slater boots?—A. Probably a misunderstanding. A lot of these people bought Slater's boots and wore them in preference to ours.

Q. But even the men in South Africa referred to the sealed samples as a similar boot. They have told us that over and over again?—A. They must have been mistaken, sir.

Now, as against this positive evidence of the assistant-director of contracts who had better knowledge of the subject than any other man who appeared as a witness, because of his long service in the department and his familiarity with these matters, my hon. friend from North Grey cited General Otter.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Will the hon. gentleman excuse me. I know he wishes to be fair. I would refer him to page 1039, where the same witness says:

By the Chairman:

Q. Those who went to South Africa, and who did not buy their own boots, wore this class of boot?—A. It was this class that went to South Africa.

He also said that the present boot was better than that pattern.

Mr. MURPHY: I am quite well aware of that, but if my hon. friend will just cast his recollection back a few weeks he will remember that at the time Mr. McCann gave the evidence he has just cited, he was in some doubt as to the date upon which Slater first began supplying boots of this character to the department, and, his answers being unsatisfactory to the committee, he was directed to go back to the department and get official information so as to inform us accurately as to the facts.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: But Mr. Slater himself subsequently swore that he supplied these boots for South Africa.

Mr. MURPHY: I am coming to that. Mr. McCann came back after getting the exact facts and gave evidence, which I have quoted, and which will be found at page 1057. Files were produced, and we had the documents there verifying it. My hon. friend said this morning that Charles E. Slater said he began supplying boots

about the time of the South African war, but Mr. Slater did not give the exact date, nor was he pressed to give the exact date. Mr. McCann gave the date, and in answer to my hon. friend himself said:

There is no doubt that none of the Slater boots were supplied to the soldiers who went to the South African war.

For the reason that the two contingents had gone before Slater began supplying them in the latter part of 1900. There is absolutely no doubt about that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: We are not saying that the present boot was the same, but that it was a better boot; but we say it was the same class of boot, and other witnesses have sworn it was the same quality.

Major General HUGHES: Is it not plain that the boots supplied by the Government then were not the Slater boot, but that the soldiers, finding the Government boot inferior, bought the Slater boot?

Mr. MURPHY: No, nothing of the kind was plain; the very reverse is the fact.

Major General HUGHES: We will verify it.

Mr. MURPHY: The very reverse is the fact. As against this positive evidence given by Mr. McCann, my hon. friend from North Grey cited some casual observations made by General Otter, who, as my hon. friends will remember, strolled into the committee room one morning, stayed there a few minutes, and answered a few questions in a casual way. What did he say? Let me refer you, Sir, and the House, to his evidence as it appears at page 927:

By Mr. Pringle:

Q. In what capacity have you served with the permanent force?—A. I have commanded a regiment in Canada, I commanded a regiment in South Africa, and I have commanded a district in Canada.

Q. What boots were the permanent force supplied with?—A. Well, it was a boot issued by the Government, a regular boot, I don't know whose it was or who it was made by.

I will read that again:

I don't know whose it was or who it was made by.

Q. Covering the period of the last ten or twelve years?—A. Yes, for the last fifteen years.

Q. You cannot speak of the maker of the boot, you do not know who made it?—A. No.

And evidence from that witness is what my hon. friend quotes to offset the positive evidence of McCann!

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: A boot was shown to him in the committee and he was asked: "Is that the class of boot you wore in South Africa?" and he said "Yes."

Mr. MURPHY: What he did say I am just going to read. It is at page 928:

Q. How long were you in South Africa?—A. 14 months.

Q. In active service?—A. All the time.

Q. What boots did your regiment have during that time?—A. It was a boot issued by the department before we left.

Q. Similar to Exhibit 12, that boot I showed you?—A. That description of boot, yes.

That is what General Otter said, just as any man would who had previously declared that he did not know who made the boot or what kind of boot it was. The defence on that score, I submit even to my hon. friend from North Grey, falls completely to the ground.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: My hon. friend has forgotten to quote the next question, which was that it was practically the same boot; that is what he says.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, without ever looking at it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I will read the whole thing.

Mr. MURPHY: I did not interrupt my hon. friend, and any of his friends can quote all this evidence.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Will the hon. member allow me to ask this question? Does he find this at page 928 of the evidence?

Q. Similar to Exhibit 12?—A. In that time, you know, the boot was changed more or less. I mean to say, every now and then they would change it; they would get improvements in it. It might be a little lower one time, and more heel in it another time, but it was practically the same boot.

Mr. MURPHY: If my hon. friend thinks that the citation improves his position I have only to refer him again to what the General said at page 927:

I don't know whose it was or who it was made by.

Q. You cannot speak of the maker of the boot, you do not know who made it?—A. No.

And I refer him again to page 928, to the General's answer:

Similar to Exhibit 12, that boot I showed you?—A. That description of boot, yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Practically the same boot, and that is the boot from which the boots were made in this case.

Mr. MURPHY: If my hon. friend is satisfied that the evidence which he has cited from Gen. Otter is more conclusive on the

point as to what boot was worn in South Africa than that given by the assistant director of contracts, then, of course, I leave my hon. friend to enjoy whatever comfort he may get out of that contention.

I have already taken up too much of the time of the House. I have given the chief reasons why we cannot concur in the report whose adoption has been moved by the hon. member from North Grey. Other reasons will be advanced by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) and possibly by other hon. gentlemen who may take part in this debate. I submit that the evidence has established mismanagement, indifference, neglect and incapacity on the part of the Government; and I, therefore move, seconded by Mr. Macdonald, that the report now read be not concurred in, but that the following be substituted in lieu thereof:

The Special Committee appointed under Order of the House on February 16, 1915, for the purpose of investigating and reporting thereon to the House the report of the Board of Inquiry consisting of Col. W. Hallick, E. A. Stephens and Theo. Galipeau, respecting boots supplied the Department of Militia and Defence as laid on the table of the House on the 15th of February, and all matters pertaining to the boots supplied to the said department, beg leave to present the following as their report

Your committee met for organization on the 19th of February when Mr. Middlebro was elected chairman. Numerous sessions have since been held and we beg to submit the printed record of the proceedings and or the evidence taken, and the exhibits received and other exhibits as the same were before us.

Your committee find that no part of a soldier's equipment is more essential to the proper performance of his duty and to his health and comfort than the boots which he wears on active service and that in preparing the Canadian soldiers for such service a special responsibility devolved and still devolves upon the Government to see that the soldiers were not and are not hampered in any way by defects in the kind of boot supplied and that especial care should have been and ought to be exercised so as to provide the very best boot obtainable, in order to insure the safety, comfort and efficiency of our soldiers while serving the Empire.

Your committee regret to report that this duty was not fulfilled by the Government in regard to the boots purchased and supplied to the Canadian soldiers who have been on active service both at home and abroad since August last, and that negligence and want of care are quite apparent. The following facts have been amply proved by the evidence submitted to us:

That the boot supplied to the Canadian permanent force previous to the war, being similar to the boot sealed by the officials of the Militia Department on January 15, 1911, was a boot suitable only for men in barracks and in times of peace, and not for men on active service;

That the boots given to the contractors in August last by the Department of Militia and Defence, as sample boots, in accordance with which they were to manufacture the boots under their contracts, were inferior to the sealed department boot in the following respects:

In the uppers the leather in the sample was lighter than the leather in sealed pattern, the difference being 1⁹⁄₁₀ in sample and 2⁴⁄₁₀ in pattern.

In vamps there was the same proportionate difference between the two as to weights and thickness.

Slugs : In the sample zinc slugs were used and in the pattern steel slugs were used and there was an additional half-row.

That no specifications were furnished to the various contractors in August last and no conditions as to details of manufacture were imposed on them other than that the boots supplied should be similar to the inferior samples above referred to and 65,000 pairs of boots were ordered in this way in August;

That the sample boots so given to contractors were taken out of a number which had been manufactured by L. Gauthier & Company, Quebec, and supplied to the Department of Militia through the intervention of Charles E. Slater, at the price of $3.72½ per pair; that the said Charles E. Slater's name was placed on the patronage list by the Minister of Militia and Defence and that the said Charles E. Slater received in commissions on boots supplied the Militia Department the sum of $15,275.

That the "last" used in the manufacture of said sample was not a proper last for the production of boots suitable for active service;

That the said sample boot was declared to be an unsuitable boot for soldiers on active service by practically every witness before us;

That the Minister of Militia and Defence personally approved of the awarding of contracts upon said sample on August 10, 1914;

That a proper and strict inspection of the boots supplied was not provided for before their delivery, and 13,926 pairs of boots were accepted at Valcartier without any inspection whatever;

That after the first orders for boots were given in August, further large quantities were ordered in September without any consideration being given to rendering the boot more suitable for active service, in some cases the sample boots submitted by manufacturers being accepted without proper care and examination and in other cases the inferior sample being again used and 32,867 pairs of boots were so ordered in September;

That on the 25th, 27th, 29th and 30th days of September a number of regimental boards sat in Halifax to consider the condition of the boots issued to men on active service in the month of August, all of which condemned the boots submitted to them that had been supplied by L. Gauthier & Company under their regular contract previous to the war, and which were of the type similar to the sample boots used as a model in the manufacture of the boots issued to the Canadian soldiers for active service. It was proven that these boots collapsed under active service conditions through ordinary wear and tear and after a short usage; that in some cases the soldiers were compelled to use slingles and bags on the soles of their boots; that three men had contracted illness on account of defective boots and were compelled in consequence to retire from the regiments. The decisions of these boards were that the boots examined by them should be

condemned and the reports of these boards were duly forwarded to headquarters, at Ottawa;

That in the month of September last, Mr. Alfred Minister of Minister, Myles Shoe Company, Toronto, who had been asked to supply boots similar to the inferior sample, stated that he declined to do so because they would be unfit for men to wear on active service and he would not make the shoes, according to sample, knowing they were going to be served out to the men who were going to the war and he did not want to make any money out of a man's life;

That in the month of September the "last" specified by the department was condemned by a contractor who declared, "he was not going to risk making shoes with that last which would not fit anybody; (See Tetreault's evidence).

That one manufacturer declared when asked his opinion of the sample supplied by the department, "It is ridiculous to put that on a soldier"; (See Tetreault's evidence).

That another manufacturer stated, that shoes made from the inferior sample were never meant for foreign service and that in his opinion the Government fully realized that the boot would not stand any hard wear when they issued it. (See Matthew's evidence.)

That another manufacturer stated that the inferior sample was not suitable for the soldiers and did not consider the boots made from it were suitable for active service. (See Adams evidence.)

That Mr. William Silver, one of the inspectors employed by the department stated that the boot was not intended for active service, and that, "we all acknowledge the boots were too light for the use they were put to;"

That on October 8th, 9th and 10th, further orders were given under similar conditions to those given in September, and 30,000 pairs of boots were ordered on said dates;

That on October 24th the department directed a change to be made in the sample boot by doing away with the slip sole that had been in use and providing in its place a double sole running through to the back of the heel, but made no further changes in the specifications or in the direction of providing a proper boot for active service, and on various dates between October 29th and November 4th, proceeded to order 40,532 pairs of boots under similar conditions as to sample boots, as they had used in September, with the exception of providing for a double sole and increasing the price of the boot to $4 per pair, and that some of said double-soled boots have been since returned before your committee, in a badly worn condition after three weeks' use.

That in the months of November and December, 1914, and January, February, March and April, 1915, grave complaints arose from the men on active service throughout the country, as to the failure of the boots supplied to them, which caused illness among the men, prevented them from performing their proper training, and occasioned much discomfort and difficulty to them;

That as a consequence over seventy Regimental Boards were summoned in the months above named, under the regulations by the commanding officers of the various corps located at different places between Calgary and Lethbridge in the West and Halifax in the East, and these boards examined 11,054 pairs of boots, which were stated in many cases to be samples of larger numbers of other boots complained of by their men, thus indicating the extent of the difficulty created by inferior boots. Of these 11,054 pairs of boots, 7,807 pairs were condemned and discarded by the various boards. (The Minister of Militia and Defence stated that he was aware of these findings and reports of these boards.)

That in Toronto 225 pairs of boots were burned, as being of no further use, and a smaller number were burned in Kingston, for the same reason;

That we have had before us the commanding officers of different battalions composing the overseas expeditionary forces and other officers of these battalions and non-commissioned officers and men now on service in Canada, who have joined in condemnation of the boots supplied by the department and declared it was not suitable for active service;

That on November 19th, General Alderson cabled to the Militia Department at Ottawa, "that the boots now being issued to the contingents were not suitable for rough wear in wet weather," and asked for instructions to purchase boots there, and to this a reply was sent that 48,000 pairs of overshoes were shipped to him. On December 5th, General Alderson again cabled, "it has been found that overshoes do not compensate for faulty construction of boots; some pairs are useless after ten days wear. Special report is being made."

That Boards of Inquiry were held in England by officers of several Canadian corps on the 11th day of November, the 19th day of November, the 5th day of December and on the 21st day of December, respectively, and reports thereon as to the character of the boots supplied to the men of the overseas forces by the Canadian Government, were made by the various colonels in command, who state among other things, that the condition of the boots had caused great inconvenience to the men since enlisting at Valcartier; that they had been found to be decidedly unserviceable and that in many cases boots have become so dilapidated that they had to be discarded altogether;

That on November 24th, Sir George Perley, Acting High Commissioner for Canada, cabled to Sir Robert Borden "authorities consider Canadian boots too light altogether; say only heavy boots adapted to compaigning; find general complaint on this account regarding boots given our Canadian contingent; stated they will not stand mud and water and heavy work. Consider overshoes impracticable as they are heavy to walk in and will last only short time on hard roads. In my opinion next contingent should be provided with boots made on regulation army pattern."

In this connection it may be observed that the troops who have gone to England since November 24th, have gone with the same kind of boots complained of by General Alderson and Sir George Perley, and no attempt was made to outfit them with different boots, and that notwithstanding all the Regimental Boards held in Canada and England and the general complaint from all quarters as to the boots, the parties to whom contracts had been given in October were permitted to go on supplying boots of the character complained of, and in some cases the delivery of these boots were not completed until the month of March and long after the committee had entered upon its labours, and no contracts were cancelled.;

That in the month of November last the Militia Department directed the senior ordnance officer to purchase boots locally in Win-

nipeg and 3,798 pairs of boots were purchased there, not directly from manufacturers of boots but through middlemen;

That owing to the fact that the boots supplied for the first overseas contingent at Valcartier and in England, were not available for our examination, the evidence, with the exception of a few isolated witnesses submitted to us as to these boots, rests upon the reports of the Regimental Boards in England and of General Alderson and other officers there, and the statement of Sir George Perley;

That on December 7, 1914, a Court of Inquiry into boots, was constituted by the Department of Militia and Defence which, on January 7, 1915, made a report to the questions submitted for their consideration, which report has been referred to us by the Order of the House constituting your committee. The witnesses before the board were not sworn and were confined to department officials, all of whom with one exception have, however, been before your committee and given their evidence under oath. This Court of Inquiry in addition to hearing the witnesses, devoted themselves to an examination of the boots referred to in their report and their findings express merely the opinions of the different members of the court who afterwards gave evidence before your committee, confirmatory of their answers to the submitted questions. The opinion of the board may be summarized in so far as the character of the boot prescribed and supplied by the department, is concerned, as follows:

That the boot was of unsuitable shape and make and that the leather contained no water-resisting medium;

That the heels and soles are unprotected and sole-filling is often poor quality;

That the boot was unsuitable for the soldiers and for the particular work for which they were provided; because,—

(a) The shape is such that the average foot has not room for the free movement of the toes and is thus not suitable for marching;

(b) The leather is dry, containing no grease, and consequently quickly absorbs the water;

(c) Soles and heels not being re-inforced with metal, soon wear down, especially when wet.

We are of the opinion that these answers as quoted, have been amply proven to be correct by the evidence submitted to us.

This report was made on January 7, 1915.

That a committee of boot manufacturers from Montreal, composed of George A. Slater, N. Tetreault, and W. S. Louson, of the Ames, Holden, McCready Company, acting apparently on their own initiative, approached the Government early in January, realizing the necessity of a better boot for the Canadian soldiers, and made representations as to the necessity of action to a Committee of the Privy Council, over which Hon. Mr. Hazen presided. It appears that a committee was appointed, composed of Mr. George Slater, Mr. Donovan, Col. Brown and E. A. Stephens, who prepared a boot which they recommended as suitable for soldiers on active service and prepared and submitted on January 21, to the department, a draft specification for a suitable boot. On this committee's work and report no action appears to have been taken, although it was sworn that Hon. Mr. Hazen stated to the committee that the boot they had prepared was approved by the Privy Council Committee and that 110,000 pairs would be ordered by the Government.

That on February 18, 1915, by Order in Council, Mr. S. R. Wickett was appointed as Chief Advisor on Boots, to the Department of Militia and Defence, on the report of the minister dated February 11, 1915. Mr. Wickett states the minister actually assigned him his duties on January 13, but he took no part in the deliberations of Hon. Mr. Hazen's Committee;

That Mr. S. R. Wickett, the Chief Advisor on Boots, is of opinion that boots of the type hitherto supplied to Canadian soldiers since the war began, are too light for active service, and expects to recommend a suitable boot much heavier throughout and with many radical changes;

That at the present time requisitions for nearly 20,000 boots are waiting to be filled in the department and there are very few boots in stock, and that practically the whole of the 180,664 pairs of boots of the type complained of have been issued to Canadian soldiers since August last, notwithstanding all the defects, the complaints, the illness and discomforts of the soldiers, and the adverse reports which have existed and been made since they were first supplied;

That the evidence before us, especially that of Mr. Tetreault on page 780, et seq., shows that the Government could have without much trouble or delay provided a proper boot suitable for soldiers on active service. It was well understood that the boot supplied to the department before the war was not an active service boot and the failure to provide a proper boot for the Canadian soldiers going on active service, constitutes grave and serious negligence on their part. It has been sworn to that they could get all the new lasts they would have required, in a week's time, and it has been sworn that the matter of drafting specifications for a boot to replace what Mr. Wickett calls a "Summer Boot" could be accomplished in the same period, but no official act on the part of the Government to provide a proper service boot was undertaken until February 18, two days after your committee was appointed;

That if the haste in forwarding the First Overseas Expedition, interfered with the providing of a proper active service boot for the men at Valcartier, there was ample time to provide for and supply such a suitable boot for the men of the Second and Third Overseas Force who have since crossed the ocean or who are still in training in Canada.

That with reference to the character of the boots manufactured under the contracts by the various contractors, we are of opinion that none of the said boots were boots suitable for active service;

That representatives of the following contractors appeared before us:

Ames, Holden & McCready Co., Ltd., Montreal.
Amherst Shoe Company, Amherst, N.S.
McPherson Shoe Company, Hamilton, Ont.
The Murray Shoe Company, London, Ont.
The Relindo Shoe Company, Toronto, Ont.
The George A. Slater Company, Montreal, Que.
The L. Gauthier Company, Quebec, Que.
The Tetreault Shoe Company, Montreal, Que.
The Valentine & Martin Co., Waterloo, Ont.
The Western Shoe Co., Berlin, Ont.

The representatives of all these Companies stated that they had manufactured and delivered

boots in accordance with the sample. The following companies were invited by telegram to offer representations to the committee, with regard to the quality of boots supplied by them, but no representative appeared on their behalf to give evidence before the committee:

The Aylmer Shoe Co., Aylmer, Ont.
The Cook-Fitzgerald Co., London, Ont.
The J. & T. Bell Co., Ltd., Montreal, Que.
J. M. Humphreys & Co., St. John, N.B.
The Regal Shoe Co., Toronto, Ont.
The E. T. Wright Co., St. Thomas, Ont.
The Hartt Boot and Shoe Co., Fredericton, N.B.
The Williams Shoe Co., Ltd., Brampton, Ont.
John Ritchie & Co., Quebec, Que.
W. B. Hamilton Shoe Co., Toronto, Ont.
The Perth Shoe Co., Perth, Ont.
The J. Leckie Co., Vancouver, B.C.

Thirteen hundred and sixty-five pairs of boots, and three hundred and forty-eight odd boots out of the number condemned by the various boards throughout the country were submitted to the inspection of Messrs. John A. Hoar, of Halifax, and Magloire Côté, of St. Hyacinthe, who made report thereon, as follows:

That out of said number of boots, two hundred and sixty-five pairs were not worth repairing; fourteen hundred and forty-eight boots were not originally equal to the sample. If the proportion of boots in this particular lot, not equal to the sample, is a fair percentage of the number of boots furnished that did not come up to the samples, out of the one hundred and eighty thousand pairs supplied, the number of boots so furnished that were inferior to sample would be seven thousand, two hundred and ninety-eight boots;

That the boot supplied to the soldiers who went to South Africa was a different boot from the sealed sample boot of 1914, and from the boots supplied to the Overseas Forces. It was in 1905 that boots of a similar pattern to the 1914 boot were first adopted by the department for use in times of peace by the permanent forces in Canada.

(See evidence of Assistant Director of Contracts McCann, No. 22, of evidence.)

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mr. J. H. RAINVILLE (Chambly and Verchères): The special committee appointed to investigate the quality of boots supplied to the soldiers, the report of which has just been submitted to the consideration of the House, has stirred public attention to a high degree. That should not cause any surprise when we consider that on one hand it involves the question of the health and welfare of our fellow citizens who leave their country to go to the front, and, on the other hand, the reputations of large and flourishing Canadian industries which have been seriously injured by allegations made.

I am sure that a fair reader of the proceedings which were held, and of the evidence adduced before the special committee, will acknowledge that we did all that was humanly possible to get at the truth—at the whole truth. As far as circumstances permitted we succeeded in getting all the evidence which might throw light on the questions submitted to us. Officers, non-commissioned officers and soldiers who wore the boots manufactured for the Canadian Government, experts in leather and the manufacture of boots explained the technique and process of manufacturing, and expressed their opinion on the value of the materials used by the manufacturers before, and, more especially since, the outbreak of the war. We have gone so far as even to let an outside lawyer, working on an outside case, come before the committee and fish at will for evidence. That lawyer at times worked in such an unfair way as to incur quite a stiff rebuke from a member of the committee, the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). From the testimony of those who, on behalf of the Government, had watched at the factory the making of the boots, we have been able to understand the kind of inspection which was caused to be made. Lastly, a great number and a variety of boots coming from different regiments in different parts of the country have been put to a severe examination by two gentlemen of unquestionable experience and repute, and they have reported fully on the question.

From that mass of evidence we had to draw conclusions. This we did honestly and impartially, and I feel confident that our conclusions will be concurred in by this House and the country in general.

If we examine with care the various grievances formulated by the opposition on this question, they may be summed up under two heads: First, the kind of boots adopted by the Government was not fit for the purpose for which it was made; and secondly, the boot made according to sample and delivered to the soldiers of the Canadian contingent, as well as the sample itself, was defective as to quality. But between those two arguments they hesitate. When they have before them boots which are admittedly good as to workmanship and material, they attack the sample according to which they were made; and when it is the contrary, they allege that the boots supplied were not in accordance with the sample. Such double play shifting may be the characteristic of an able lawyer, but for a judge it is generally the sign of a lost cause. And it is established that on these two points the boots in question were satisfactory, if we are fair enough to take into account, as every reasonable man will do, the exceptional circumstances under which they were made, inspected, issued to soldiers and worn by them.

This inquiry is the result of the report made on the 6th and 7th January, 1915, by the commission which was presided over by Lt.-Colonel Hallick, and composed of Messrs. Stephens and Galipeau. We would not allow ourselves to be guided by, and we could not in justice rely upon, such a report, which, at all events, is highly deficient, for the evidence was not taken under oath. The previous inquiry was altogether a failure, for while it purports to show certain special defects in the boots, it concludes by stating that "the boots manufactured were, generally speaking, well made and of good quality."

The first and main grievance brought forward is the shape of the boots and the lightness that makes same unsuitable for the purpose for which they were made, let us say the word, for active service. Lt.-Colonel Hallick's report recommends the adoption of the English boot (the British Army boot) which is much heavier than the Canadian.

Mr. MURPHY: Or some similar boot.

Mr. RAINVILLE: Yes. We come here to one of the most difficult, the most debatable, and most debated upon, questions that governments of all nations have had to deal with in the past. Military authorities in every country have, after various and multiplied experiments, adopted a certain type of boot for their army, but the pattern varies according to the country. The English boot is different from the French and is still more at variance with the American. The American army boot is the lightest by a great deal. As far as weight is concerned, the English boot is the heaviest, then comes the French, the Canadian, and lastly the American. The latter was adopted by the United States army after four years of experiments, and after they had examined the patterns used by all the great nations of the world.

Consequently, is it possible, or is it fair to cast blame on the Canadian Government, before as well as after 1911, or on the officers of the militia staff, for having pronounced in favour of a boot somewhat lighter than the British boot and somewhat heavier than the American? No; I say it is not. It is a matter of opinion which will always be open to discussion. It may never be settled absolutely satisfactorily, but if the problem is ever solved it will probably be due to the fact that the means will have been found for giving three pairs of boots to each soldier, one pair of rubber boots for circumstances such as were found at Salisbury Plain, one pair of heavy boots for trench work in France, and one pair of light boots (like the Canadian) for marching to Berlin, the quickest possible.

Just now, here in Canada, opinions of experts are divided into three categories: One favours the heavy boot of the standard screw type with hob nails and steel plate, like the English one, another lauds the use of the light boot of the Canadian type (Goodyear welt), while others recommend a combination of the two. It is reasonable to think that the British army boot, because of its weight, shrould be more suitable for the new process of underground war and trenches than the light one, but for the same reason, that is because of its weight, it seems the more unfit for marching. This is a serious defect when one realizes that in war the facility and promptness with which an army can move and displace itself is one of the essentials of victory. Volumes could be written in favour of the light boot and also in favour of the heavy one as well. This shows that in such questions it is not possible to adopt absolute rules.

A full discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the British boot would not be in my line, but I may be permitted to say this much that many experts in Canada are strongly in favor of the light boot. Mr. Matthews, Lieutenant Whitby, Pte. Ross, General Hughes, General MacDonald, Colonel Macdonald, Colonel Brown, Colonel Currie, Major Ranger and many others are in favour of the light boot.

It is true that the minority give great weight to the opinions of General Alderson and Sir George Perley. But this is, after all, indirect evidence which cannot destroy the evidence from soldiers having just come back from Salisbury and testifying, under oath, before the committee, opinions contrary to those given by these two gentlemen. Besides, just as much credit could be given to the opinions expressed by Lieut.-Col. Currie and Major Ranger, who have been at Valcartier, at Salisbury Plains, and are to-day on the firing line in France.

Paul Emile Ranger, of Montreal, an officer whom most of the members for Quebec know, gives, in a long and detailed diary recently published by La Presse of Montreal, a vivid account, day by day, from the 11th February to the 6th March, of the life of our soldiers in the trenches and their conduct in action, recording the gallant deeds which have inscribed on the roll of honor the names of such men as Hardy, Valin, Lacroix, Martin, Delong-

champs, etc. And one would notice, while reading this account, the unassuming way in which the most heroic deeds are recited, showing the deep conviction, the true soldiery spirit of our men, now in war, and whose gallantry showed them to be the worthy comrades of the trained soldiers of France and England. While speaking of their life in the trenches Major Ranger has a word to say about the accoutrements. He mentions that his men have been supplied with English military boots and recalls, as his personal experience, that after one hour and a half walking in the trenches at night, he felt as if his shoes weighed fifty pounds. In his diary of the 4th of March he gives the opinion of his men on the same subject as follows:

Their greatest annoyance comes from their boots. They miss their Canadian boots for the English boots are no good. These last boots take credit for heavy and thick soles, but most of the time the sole is too thick for the uppers and after a few days' wearing gives way entirely.

Besides, they are not waterproof. As a general rule our men prefer the Canadian boots, more soft and better constructed, and I share their opinion.

I can give another testimony which should have as much weight as that of Sir George Perley or General Alderson, and it is the testimony of Private H. E. Parker, as contained in the following letter addressed to the Hon. Minister of Militia and Defence:

309 South Marks Street,
Fort William, Ont.,
April 1, 1915.

The Hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—Having reference to the inquiry regarding quality of boots supplied to the soldiers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, I have the honour to inform you that I have at present in my possession and still wearing, the pair of regulation boots issued to me at Valcartier during the latter part of August, 1914. These boots have been in continual use since issue to date.

I had been issued with a pair of Imperial service boots, but such were stolen from me before I had an opportunity of using them.

The boots issued to me in Valcartier have been worn through all the mud and rain that obtained during the period of our training at Salisbury Plain, and are still in a fairly serviceable condition.

I further have the honour to inform you, that I heard very few complaints regarding the Canadian service boot. On the contrary, the men invariably preferred this boot to the heavy Imperial service one.

[Mr. Rainville.]

Should you require my boots as an exhibit, they are at your disposal.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
H. E. PARKER,
Late 8th Brg. C.E.F. Pte.

P.S.—I have just returned from service with the Canadian Expeditionary force in consequence of disability through paralysis of right arm and hand.—H. P.

All these things being considered, can we find ourselves at all justified in blaming the Canadian Government or the officers of the militia for having kept the Canadian boots as they were? Let us realize that the time for deliberating and making experiments in this respect had gone; it was too late. We had neither four years nor one, nor even one month, to restudy the matter.

The Canadian people, like all the other colonies, were rising, united, to promptly assist the Mother Country. No one in Canada, then, would fail to see an emergency. Can one imagine the indignation that would have been felt in this House and in this country, if, instead of putting himself immediately in a position to issue boots and other equipment to our soldiers, General Hughes had taken the attitude of making experiments of all kinds? Action was necessary, and the present Minister of Militia, it cannot be denied, answered with immediate action to the best knowledge and ability that could be had and shown in such an emergency, to rapidly equip the Canadian contingents. When war broke out, the Department of Militia had at their disposal a pattern of boot that had been in use since 1900, or at least since 1904, and as to which no serious complaints had been heard. I think we can safely say that this boot was the result of the experience of the South African war, and it was established that it has given satisfaction ever since. General Macdonald, on pages 211, 221, 213 and 216, said that some boots made according to the sealed sample had been worn by our soldiers in South Africa. Lieut.-Col. MacDonald, on page 236, and General Lessard, page 468, said that boot was thought to be advisable under the circumstances. By doing what they do, those who were responsible for efficiency acted prudently and listened to the voice of sound reason. That is the conclusion I have reached on that point. We have purely and simply applied the rule which in matters of liability is acknowledged as a principle of law all over the world, and according to which he who acts like a prudent, diligent paterfamilias, who administers and manages his business and

property with the ordinary prudence of a reasonable man, must be held to have done what could be possibly expected of him. That is the principle of law laid down in the Civil Code of Quebec, and I presume it is a principle of law which is common to every civilized country in the world.

The boots issued to the soldiers were made according to samples approved by the Government officers, and were in use by the permanent force in Canada. Out of 180,000 pairs made by the manufacturers, 178,000 pairs have already been issued. Several of the manufacturers who obtained boot contracts, gave their evidence before the committee and all agreed that the material was excellent and the workmanship was good. The inspectors placed by the Government to watch over the making of the boots in the factories themselves assure us of their having done all in their power to rigourously inspect the boots in the then pressing circumstances under which the inspection was taking place, and it is established that, with the exception of a few instances of little importance, the boots were of good quality and in most cases superior to the sample. This is proven by the witnesses, as well as by the two experts, Mr. Hoar and Mr. Côté, who were unanimously chosen by the committee to make a report on the boots. The inspection no doubt did not cover the whole of the 180,000 pairs, because there were about 14,000 pairs which were sent direct to Valcartier and which, because of the pressing demand and lack of accommodation, had to be delivered to the soldiers without inspection. But there was no time to waste and the recruits at Valcartier could not be allowed to go without boots, which unanswerable reason made it necessary to issue a certain quantity without inspection. I quote from the evidence of Lieutenant Colonel Hallick, when questioned on this point, at page 59:

By Mr. Rainville:

Q. When you were pressing for the delivery of the boots, did you attend to the requesting of delivery yourself?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you wire any firms or to the Government to press delivery?—A. I only wired to my chief here at headquarters and told him I was short of boots.

Q. Where they shipped to Valcartier camp?—A. They were sent direct from the manufacturers to me on my demand.

This shows that if the boots were delivered at Valcartier without inspection it was for a very good reason, and there is nothing in it to merit blame for the Government or for the officers of the militia. We must not believe that this absence of inspection, which the manufacturers could not anticipate in order to make a cheap boot, had an influence on the making of the boots in question. The manufacturers could not expect that any of their boots would escape inspection, and surely they would not have run the risk of making bad boots and having them rejected, in the hope that there might be no inspection. It must be admitted that the absence of inspection did certainly involve the issue of certain boots, which, under normal conditions and under inspection, would have been detected as inferior, and rejected.

The report on the rejected boots is a most direct answer to the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite. Out of the 86,000 boots issued to the different regiments all over the country only about 7,000 pairs were condemned. The committee wired to the different military centres to ship back to Ottawa the boots that were condemned, but some of them, such as Calgary, did not send these boots to the committee and the reason for that we do not know. However, a great many regiments sent their boots to Ottawa, and they were examined by the two experts appointed by the committee.

The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) has quoted many of the findings of the different boards of inquiry, and he is under the impression that he has proved that the reports of all these boards were genuine and should be taken as proof. I contend that the reports of these boards were not confirmed by the evidence given before the committee of this House. They were not confirmed in the case of Major McKenzie of St. John, N.B., who spoke about the leather being rubbish and who admitted that he had made a mistake, as will be found in the evidence at pages 392 and 393. These reports were not confirmed in the case of Quartermaster Taunton of Winnipeg, who at page 405 of the evidence admits his error about scrap and glue. They were not confirmed in the case of Major Andrews of Winnipeg, who admits his error as regards paper, and whose evidence will be found on page 424; nor in the case of Lieutenant A. E. Whitby of Toronto, who admits that the soldiers were drying their boots around the furnace, and who would not recommend the British army boot because, he said, it was too heavy.

My hon. friend said something about the Ottawa boots. Of these there were 309 pairs issued, nine pairs of which were brought before the committee. Three of these nine pairs were good boots and one was burned, so that four out of those nine pairs could

not be complained of, and only five pairs had the soles worn out.

Certain hon. gentlemen opposite, with minds strongly bent on criticising, hold the Government liable as for a crime for the least omission of any kind. The present Administration and Militia Department will not pretend to possess supernatural infallibility. We maintain that from the evidence adduced, it is clear that the representatives of the Government, such as superior officers and inspectors, and the manufacturers and tanners, have shown the best of good faith, sincere honesty and great care for the welfare of our soldiers. It is possible that a few errors of judgment may have occurred on their part; but in all justice must we not give to the Administration, at the head of a country which for more than a hundred years has lived in peace and only in anticipation of a lasting peace, credit for the superhuman efforts made by it in a time of great emergency to face the immediate eventualities of a war which took by surprise all the European countries, except perhaps Germany, which caused it, and which I hope will get the worst of it?

In this inquiry the attention of the public is centred on the boot question, with no reference made and no regard paid to the innumerable difficulties with which the Administration has had to cope in undertaking to equip with boots, necessary clothes, arms, ammunition, food, and so on, an army of infantry, cavalry and artillery of over 100,000 men. We are within the facts as revealed by the evidence when we assert that the great majority of the boots which were returned to Ottawa as defective had been worn by the soldiers for from six to eight weeks, and we are told by the experts that such is about the limit of time within which a boot may be reasonably expected to wear under the exceptional circumstances which, the inquiry revealed, existed at the time at Valcartier and in other parts of the country. To prove that, I could quote Lieut.-Col. Hallick at page 59, Mr. Stephens at page 43, and Mr. Silver at pages 305 to 306. A great many of these boots were repairable, but they were not repaired, either through carelessness or through there being no cobblers with the regiments. That, however, is not a good ground on which to hold the Department of Militia or the Government liable for negligence or carelessness or any fault, because it must be observed that the boots which were reported as defective or bad were recently examined by two absolutely disinterested and qualified experts, and the result of their careful examination is more effective than any argument that can be adduced in answer to all that has been said or written against the Canadian military boot.

Hon. gentlemen opposite attach a great deal of importance to complaints lodged by the local boards of inquiry composed of the officers of various regiments throughout the country. It was objected that a great part of the evidence was not given under oath, and that it had to a great extent no legal value. I do not intend entering here into a discussion of that question, which has been dealt with fully by my colleagues; I rely only on the reports and on the evidence adduced upon their contents by the officers of these local boards of inquiry who appeared before us to give evidence on the worst cases mentioned in their reports. Without attacking the honour of our soldiers or officers, I wish to express my opinion that these reports do not conclusively establish that the boots so reported defective were all or in the majority of cases defective. I base that opinion on the fact that such inquiries were somewhat hurriedly held and quickly disposed of, and on the lack of experience of those who held them. I may be permitted to add, without offending my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who often objected in committee when we were trying to find out the reason for the condemnation of the boots, that boards of inquiry were held, in the majority of cases, not with a view to searching into the causes of deterioration of the boots complained of, but in order to obtain, through what appeared to be the only available machinery, a second issue of boots. The holding of such boards where boots are to be condemned, is the only means that the regiments have at their disposal to get from the department what they claim from their officers. Let me quote the evidence of Major McKenzie on page 391, as follows:

> Our idea was to get these boots condemned so that we could take over our men on parade with decent boots.

Colonel Jones' evidence on page 345 is as follows:

> Q. Is it not generally conceded in many regiments that the men want to get new boots as often as they can?—A. Oh, yes.

The reports of these boards are more often rejected than accepted by the department, according to Quartermaste-

General Macdonald, and I am under the impression that Major General Fiset said that he had not much confidence in these boards, and that in the Militia Department they were putting them aside because experience showed that they were of little value. A salient fact is that no mention can be found in these reports of any boots that were repairable that may have been burned or cut or destroyed by the wearer. The evidence, however, shows that a certain number of boots deteriorated in that way, and that the great majority of the others were repairable. Let me refer again to the summary of the report of the two experts who examined the condemned boots. Out of 1,713 inspections, only 265 boots were found not worth repairing, and out of these 265, were 112 injured by burning.

What is the reason for that omission? It is to be found in the fact that no deteriorated boot will be renewed which has become defective through fault or negligence of the wearer and he has to get, according to regulations, a new pair at his own expense. A new issue at the public expense will only take place when it is shown that the boots were worn through "fair wear and tear" or when they are defective or of bad quality.

Far be from me the idea of trying to blame the officers of the regiments for that zeal towards their soldiers. Nobody would think of blaming them. We are in this war not to try to economize on a few pairs of boots to be supplied to the soldiers, when the loyal soldiers are willing to give their very lives for the welfare and security of the country. We would equally refuse to blame the Department of Militia for accepting boots in the first rush contracts without inspection, when we find the goods furnished by the manufacturers were made according to a sample constructed under the specifications that had been approved since the South African war and discussed many times since.

As for the Gauthier Co., of Quebec, of which so much has been said in the newspapers and in the committee, to the great disappointment perhaps of the critics the experts have classified them the equal of any other company which made military boots in Canada. It is true that a certain Charles E. Slater secured a fat commission from that company, but the company alone were the sufferers as the Government paid the same price to them as to others and there is no fault to find with the quality of leather used by Gauthier, and the construction was shown to be equal to others.

The following is a summary of the report of an inspection made on two boxes of Gauthier boots:

Number of pairs of boots inspected.. .. 187
All the boots were substantially up to sample with the following exceptions:
Number of soles not up to No. 10 gauge, they being 9½ 9, 9, and 8 respectively.. 4
Number of flanky uppers.. 2
Number poorly lasted.. 2
Number of pairs not mated.. 3
Ten boots, or one boot in every twenty-five pairs were cut open and examined thoroughly, the remainder were examined superficially.

This report is signed by M. C. Wade, clerk of inspectors, who made the examination. As to the propriety of the transaction it is a matter between Mr. Slater and his conscience, when we know that he made that commission contract with a widow whose husband's death had left her without an adviser and who could easily be convinced, by a man who had had practically the furnishing of all boots under the late Administration, that she could trust Charley Slater in trying to get her contracts from the Government.

In conclusion: We have devoted two months' time to this inquiry; we had fifty-one sittings and heard eighty-seven witnesses, saw and examined some hundreds of pairs of boots. Some 86 exhibits of all kinds were produced. From the hearing of such a long evidence it will not appear improper for a member of that commission to draw the conclusion which seems to him to be the only one which can possibly be reached.

I would be prepared to say that the Canadian boot, bettered as much as can be through the experience obtained during this war, was very good. Since December the double sole was added, hobnails and horseshoe plates could be added as well to improve the wearing quality of the sole. As a whole the boots have given satisfaction and are the most suitable shoe for our voluntary soldiers. The soldiers themselves are the ones that we should please and satisfy in general.

Major Ranger and Colonel Currie, at the front, speaking for themselves and for their men, prefer the Canadian boot to the heavy English boot. Witnesses who came back from Salisbury Plain having worn the English boot are of the same opinion, and this is the only direct evidence we had on the question of a heavy boot or a medium boot such as the Canadian.

As far as our Canadian manufacturers are concerned, it is just that out of this inquiry there should come the true con-

clusion about it, and that the repute and trustworthiness of this Canadian trade when every one is at work in favour of "made in Canada," should still appear in its true light, not lessened but increased and acknowledged, and that for the benefit of our country it should be allowed to continue the pursuit of its destiny towards progress and more prosperity.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): I do not pretend to analyse the evidence in this case. That has been done by those who have spoken before me. But I will endeavour to consider the matter from the standpoint of a business man and in the light of such business training and experience as I have had.

I confess that I think the chairman of the committee, the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), in his address was very reasonable. There is no doubt that the evidence the hon. gentleman quoted is there. But we think that the evidence to the contrary is there in greater proportion than the evidence that the hon. gentleman used to back up his report.

5 p.m.

Otherwise we would not have made up the report. I went on the committee, I think, absolutely without prejudice, naturally feeling a sympathy for the manufacturers on account of the fact that I am, to a certain extent, a representative of the manufacturers, not in the shoe business, of course. But my theory in life is to give everybody, as nearly as possible, an absolutely fair deal. That is why I could not understand from the start, nor could I understand at the finish, why the papers selected the remarks of the witnesses that were very harsh, to say the least. I appreciate that newspaper men are running their own papers and may do as they please. So far as I am personally concerned I have never attempted during my life to interfere with the way anybody ran their papers or did their business, so long as they keep within the law. But I could not appreciate just why the newspapers seemed to have a prejudice and did not wait for the evidence. The manufacturer, to a large extent, has been proved to have manufactured his boots according to the samples given him by the department before he started to manufacture. Now I think that if a manufacturer or a contractor of any kind fulfils his contract, that that is all that he is reasonably called upon to do. In accordance with the report of the experts, so-called, the gentlemen who were selected to examine the boots that have been returned from all over the country to the Chairman of the committee, and in accordance with our report, about 4 per cent of the boots that we gave them to examine were not equal to sample. You must bear in mind too that in accordance with our report the samples that were given to the manufacturers to manufacture from were not quite equal to the sealed pattern that had been in the department for a number of years. We specify in our report how they were not quite equal.

In the uppers the leather in the sample was lighter than the leather in sealed pattern, the difference being 1 6-10 in sample and 2 4-10 in pattern.

This was measured by means of one of those scientific instruments that Mr. Tetreault, a large manufacturer in Montreal, had at the committee and he did the measuring:

In vamps there was the same proportionate difference between the two as to weight and thickness.

Slugs: In the sample zinc sluge were used and in the pattern steel slugs were used and there was an additional half-row.

Now there is no question as to that being correct as to the various samples I think Nos. 12, 55, 57 and 67 that were given to the manufacturers to manufacture from. No specifications were given for the first 65,000 pairs of boots that were manufactured and most of the manufacturers swore that they had no specifications in their possession, that they were given the sample, to manufacture, practically speaking, by it. But out of the 1,713 inspections which consisted of 1,365 pairs of boots and 384 single boots, there were 68 that were not equal to the sample. We say in our report that if that same proportion held for the whole 180,000 pairs of boots that were manufactured, that would be 7,000 and some odd that were not equal to the sample. My hon. friend from North Grey takes exception to that, and says that it is a reasonable argument that we should apply that only to the boots that were brought before the various boards, which numbered 11,054. Naturally we do not agree with that, because, in the first place, none of the boots that went to Valcartier were complained about excepting through those boards from England that reported and through General Alderson.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The 86,000 does not include any of the boots that went to Valcartier or that went to England. The

86,000 are simply composed of the boots that have remained in Canada.

Mr. NESBITT: I appreciate that, but we take into consideration the boots that were supplied to go to Valcartier as well as those that remained in Canada, and we say if they were not up to sample in proportion there were 7,000 odd of the 180,000 boots supplied that were not up to sample. I am quite free to say that I do not consider that was a very large number. I can appreciate that, no matter who was making the boots or no matter how they were made, there would be a certain percentage of them that would not be up to standard. At the same time that does not do away with the fact that the first 65,000 pairs of boots that were manufactured and that went to Valcartier were not properly inspected, as we say in our report. That is, there were 13,000 odd, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 14,000, that were not inspected at all, and those that were inspected in the factories were inspected, some of them at least, by men who were just picked up in a haphazard way, who probably did not know anything about inspecting boots. The only real inspector we found who was certainly up to his work was a Mr. Silver, who had had great experience, and who inspected the boots, I think, at Tetreault's. These are the boots that went to Valcartier. But at the same time there was a lack of inspection, as we say in our report, and practically that is borne out entirely or almost entirely by the evidence. My hon. friend from North Grey says that of the boots that Mr. Hoar and Mr. Côté examined here, a certain number were not worth repairing, 265; and he subdivides them, saying that some were hurt by cutting and some by spurs and some by nails. I did not hear my hon. friend expain that the nails he here complains of were the unfortunate men's toe nails. They could not very well take their toe nails off when they put their boots on; and, therefore, I do not see how that could be considered the fault of the men, unless you grew some peculiar type of man that had no toe nails. A great many of the boots we saw had a hole there where the nail of the big toe was supposed to have worn its way through. I do not think that should happen, and that is one of the faults that we find, that the last was too thin at the toe; and it was not only too thin at the toe, but also too narrow; it did not give a reasonable amount of room for the toe to work in without cutting the leather. Surely, if anything could be a fault, that was. According to this report there were a certain number of boots burnt, and 1,448 of the 1,713 boots that were condemned can be repaired. But, because a boot has not got to the stage where it cannot be repaired, it does not follow that it is a good boot. There must be something wrong—I am not going to say what—with a boot that lasts only two or three weeks, and personally I do not believe that such a boot is a good boot. Perhaps it might have been up to the sample at that.

My hon. friend dwelt at considerable length on the boot that was used in South Africa. Mr. McCann swore that the boot used in South Africa was made by a man called Radden, and if I remember his evidence correctly, he said that a good many of the men who went to South Africa purchased their own boots. But personally, I do not see what the boot used in South Africa has to do with the present case. The South African campaign was entirely different. I was never in that country, but from what I have read I understand that it is very dry, and consequently the boot that would be good for South Africa would not necessarily be good for Canada or England or France or Belgium. I quite agree that General Otter said that it was similar to the boot that was shown to him. but I do not belive that he paid very much attention anyway to the boots in South Africa. He did say that they had to buy the English boot over there, or if he did not say it somebody else did. Major General Hughes said that he had in his possession a pair of boots that went through the South African campaign and were in first-class shape now. He offered to show them to the committee. I remember that he said that they were not supplied by the Government, but purchased out of his own good hard money.

Major General HUGHES: I did not say they were bought in England; they were bought in Capetown. Many of the Canadians bought boots from Slater in Canada before they started for South Africa to replace the other ones.

Mr. NESBITT: I was not going to say that the minister purchased his in England, but that he purchased them out of his own good hard money.

Major General HUGHES: They were made in England, but bought in Capetown.

Mr. NESBITT: That puts us both right. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) said that if the officials of the de-

partment had been changed, we should have complained about that too. So far as I am concerned I want everybody to understand that it would not have made any difference to me whether the officials had been appointed under the Conservative or under the Liberal regime. It was the duty of those in power at the time, no matter who appointed them, to see that the boots given to the soldiers were properly made and satisfactory. My hon. friend from North Grey says that no dubbing was supplied at the start off, and that the different regiments had no cobblers at the beginning of the war. I quite agree, but that was not the fault of the unfortunate soldier, nor the fault of the manufacturer. Whose fault was it? It certainly was not my fault, because I was not consulted. I should like to ask my hon. friend whose fault it was. It must come down to this. It was the fault of the Government, or the fault of the department. I quite admit that a great deal may be said by way of excuse for the first lot of boots that went to Valcartier, and for other things that were lacking. But from a businessman's standpoint I say that there was no possible excuse for giving a repeat order for the same kind of boots that the evidence goes to show there were complaints about after the first two weeks at Valcartier. Some of the manufacturers themselves, if I remember correctly, freely admitted that there were complaints after the first two weeks.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where does that appear in the record?

Mr. NESBITT: I think in Mr. Matthews' evidence you will find a letter from the Ames-Holden people to the department stating that they had heard numerous complaints, and wanting to know whether the department had heard of them. There is a long letter in the evidence to that effect. There is no doubt at all that there were complaints.

Major General HUGHES: I shall be very glad if my hon. friend can show me where complaint was made concerning the boots at Valcartier. I was there nearly all the time myself and never heard a complaint either directly or indirectly.

Mr. NESBITT: There is in the evidence a long letter from the Ames-Holden people to the department drawing attention to the fact that they had heard about complaints, and wanting to know whether the department had heard about them or not. In any event there were plenty of complaints, if I mistake not, from the various regimental boards held throughout the country, and these complaints were made before the second orders were given.

Some of my hon. friends tried to prove before the committee that it would take a long time to change the model and the last. On the contrary, it was clearly proved by Tetreault and other large manufacturers who appeared before the committee that it would take only a very short time. All of us who have had any experience in getting out patterns know that it does not take a man more than a day to make a model of a last, and that it does not take him more than two days at the outside, perhaps not more than a day, to make the pattern. I am quite sure that some of the large manufacturers would have any number of lasts in their factories that would have been quite satisfactory for the department to use in making these boots.

If I am not mistaken the hon. member for North Grey, in quoting the report of Mr. Hallick as to the number of boots that had been examined before the regimental boards, gave 7,807 as the number that were examined.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I said that 7,000 odd had been condemned. There were some 11,000 that came before the board.

Mr. NESBITT: Oh, that is all right, then. In my judgment there are just two questions in regard to these boots. On the evidence we cannot complain that the manufacturers did not make their boots up to sample or within a reasonable limitation of it. My hon. friend from North Grey quoted the evidence of the men who came back from Salisbury Plain and in this connection the peculiar fact must be noted that the boots on both of these men were lined boots. There is another incident in regard to which the papers were not quite fair. They reported that the uppers of the boots manufactured by one of these concerns were glued together. As a matter of fact the lining was cemented and a very peculiar thing is that the two pairs of boots that came back from Salisbury Plain to be examined were found to be lined boots. Personally, I think that would have been an improvement, but that is only my own opinion.

There are only two questions that really affect us in this inquiry and one of them is this: Were these proper boots for active service? The other question is: If they were not, why were they not replaced long ago, or why were the orders for them con-

tinued? Let me examine the question whether they were fit for active service. I think my hon. friends who were on the committee with me will not differ from me when I say that the great mass of the evidence that was brought before the committee by all parties tended to prove that this was not a proper boot for active service. All the manufacturers without exception swore that they did not think that it was a proper boot for active service. All the departmental officials, practically speaking, except the Quartermaster General, swore that it was not a proper boot for active service. Even the Major General said that there were certain improvements that he would have advised over the boots that were issued but on the whole he thought it was a good boot. All the rest of the officials of the Militia Department who came before us, excepting the Quartermaster General stated that they did not think the boot was satisfactory for the service for which it was intended. All the manufacturers distinctly swore that they had told the department that it was not a proper boot and that they offered suggestions as to what would make a proper boot. I do not see why my hon. friends dwell on the English boot. We did not say anything about the English boot, we did not say that it was a proper boot, we did not recommend it at all; in fact, we were very careful not to recommend any boot. We simply made our findings on the boot that was before the committee as being the boot that was supplied. We did not feel it to be our duty to recommend a proper boot, but I must say personally that the boot that I think would be the most satisfactory was the boot that was designed by the Shoe Manufacturers' Association. That boot was exhibited before the committee by Mr. Tetreault, and it looked to me like the very best boot that could be used. That is only my personal opinion, and I may be a thousand miles astray. There is no question but that everybody who came before the committee swore that he did not think that the boot that was being supplied was a satisfactory boot. The hon. member for North Grey and the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres (Mr. Rainville), who are two very fine gentlemen, and with whom I agreed very excellently on the committee, are not quite fair when they say that the regimental boards that were called simply condemned these boots in order to get new boots. It is not quite fair to play hot and cold. We heard eulogies of these men the other day in the House; they were men of the highest character, men that you could trust anywhere, and with anything, in the world, and yet my hon. friends, when their ox is being gored a little bit, say that you cannot trust these regimental boards, that they have made these reports for the purpose of getting new boots, and they also add that there is small blame to them for doing so. I know many of these men, and they are highly intelligent men. These officers came before us, and they certainly looked as if they knew what they were talking about. They told us what they thought without any hesitation. They distinctly declared that it was not true that they had allowed these boots to be condemned for the purpose of getting new boots. But they did say that these boots were not fit for their men to wear, and that was why they had condemned them.

I have taken more or less interest in this boot question, outside of the committee as well as inside of it, and I have followed this evidence very carefully. I have stopped innumerable soldiers since this inquiry commenced and asked them about their boots. I have never stopped one who did not condemn the boots. There must be something wrong somewhere. I have made up my mind that there must be something wrong. I remember meeting some soldiers at home. They had come back from Guelph. It was a little sloppy, the sun was shining, part of the sidewalk was bare and part of it was wet with sloppy snow. I met a number of these men belonging to the third contingent. I thought they belonged to the second contingent and had come from London but I found that they had come from Guelph. I stopped them and examined their boots. There was evidence given before the committee that the leather simply absorbed the water. That is what had occurred in this case and the leather in these men's boots looked more like buckskin than leather—some of the witnesses say more like blotting paper, but I think that is an exaggeration. Certainly the boots were soaking in the water and they would not keep the water out. They said that they had greased them. One pair was broken out at the toes and the soles were all nearly cracked across. The hon. gentlemen say there is evidence to prove that in many instances where the soles were cracked across it was due to over-heating. That may be true, but you cannot get over the fact that all the men I have questioned, and I have questioned many, have con-

demned the boots to a very large extent. They were not considering whether they were up to sample or not; they were condemning the boots because they thought they were not good boots. They did not consider whether they were up to sample or not; that was a part of our duty. If the manufacturer made them up to sample, that, in my judgment, would clear him. These men were complaining of the boots because they were not satisfactory. They might think that it was a fairly good boot but it was not a satisfactory boot for the purpose for which it was intended.

There has been more or less about the boots having been improved to a certain extent by the time the last 40,000 were ordered. There is a double sole running back to the heel in place of the slip sole which only goes back to the ball of the foot. Strange to say, just the other day, and immediately before we rose, one of those regimental boards came before us with nine pairs of boots. I certainly examined these nine pairs of boots and several of these were the double-soled boots the orders for which were given in the latter part of October or the first of November whereas the evidence before us went to show that a great many of them were not supplied until after the first of the year and some not until the first of March. The men to whom these boots had been issued formed a battery which had been gotten up within the last month and they only had their boots issued to them a short time ago. I noticed some of the boots that were exhibited were these same double-soled boots. If nothing else had convinced me that there was something wrong with the boots which were being given to the men that of itself would because it was absolutely ridiculous to me to know these boots, worn only two or three weeks around Ottawa here, should have been worn out. I know what the weather was, I know what the streets have been because I have been walking around every day myself.

The boots supplied to the soldiers are heavier than those I am now wearing, but although I have been around here in wet weather and in dry my boots are still good, and if the boot supplied to the soldiers were properly made and of good material they would be good too. However, we could see from the boots submitted to the committee that there was something wrong with them. The hon. gentleman from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) says there were only 11,000 pairs of boots complained about, but the evidence of the officers who sat on these regimental boards throughout the country is that nearly all the boots issued were complained of. I gathered from the evidence of the witnesses that the 11,000 pairs gave out when only worn a short time, and that it is only as to these boots that the men complained.

The whole question comes down to what the Government or the department could have done when the first complaints came in, and the complaints came very soon after the boots were issued, because the first boots having been ordered on the 10th of August, delivery commenced on the 21st of August, and regimental boards were sitting in different parts of Canada to inquire into complaints on the 25th, the 27th and the 30th of September. My hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) took strong exception to the evidence given by Mr. Minister, but the hon. gentleman should have said that while Mr. Minister did say he would have made the boots for $4.85, he also stuck to his story that he would not have made them on the last or of the pattern that was shown him. His evidence was that he would adopt his own idea of a boot at the price mentioned, and to show that, he exhibited a boot before the committee. The people of Canada will ask if the boots issued to our soldiers were satisfactory for the purposes for which they were intended, and the answer of the people will be that they were not. I do not believe there is a man in this country who if he were going to do the work the soldiers were expected to do would choose a pair of the boots issued by the Government. I do not believe that the work of a farmer, or the work of a lumberman, would be as hard on a boot as the work of the soldier who has to do heavy marching and to carry heavy weight. The soldier is supposed not only to go on soft ground like the farmer and the lumberman, but he has to trudge over roads whether rough or smooth. I firmly believe, therefore, that the soldier requires a better boot than the farmer or the lumberman, and I do not think any man in this House would have chosen the boots supplied to the soldiers, if he were going to engage in either occupation.

The question comes up: Could the Government have supplied better boots than those they did supply? The boot that was supplied followed a sample which had been in the department since 1905, and which had been used by the permanent forces which, as I understand it, had no very

serious work to do. They were used in cities and in barracks, and as to this, the evidence of the witnesses was that they wanted a boot which would take a polish. Generally speaking, for the work of the soldier in peace, these boots were reasonably satisfactory, although Mr. McCann and Mr. Brown do say that there have been more or less complaints in the fall and the spring every year. But, even if there had been no complaints about the boots previously, everybody knew that our soldiers were going on active service, and that a different boot and a better boot would be required. Hon. gentlemen opposite say if the weather had been dry these boots would not require to have heavy soles, but I do not agree with them. My personal experience is that whether the weather is dry or wet, if one is going to walk a great deal he wants a strong pair of boots. The question arises as to how long it would have taken the Government to have secured a change of pattern so as to supply a better boot. The evidence of Mr. Tetreault shows that it could have been done in a week, and I think he is absolutely correct as to that. I believe myself that any large manufacturer in the country could have secured a new last and made a new pattern in a very short time, and indeed the manufacturers themselves told us that there were numerous lasts in their factories which were quite as good as the lasts which have recently been shown to the committee, and which are far more satisfactory than that used. That being the case, there was no possible excuse in my mind for the second issue of boots of the same kind as the first issue.

There is no doubt in my mind that the boot is not a satisfactory boot for active service, and that it could have been changed before the second orders were given had reasonable business attention been given to the matter. Any man in business in a large way would have given such a matter proper attention, and the Government, if it had acted in a businesslike manner would have changed the boot, and there would have been no difficulty in getting satisfactory boots after the first issue. I will not dwell longer on this question; the evidence is before the public if they want to read it, and they will come to their own conclusions.

I have just come across the report in regard to the nine boots examined which were taken from the 25th Battery of Ammunition Column, and it reads as follows:

Five pairs worn through at toe; one pair, heel rotten, fell off in a week; two pairs, soles worn off; one pair, warped so badly as to be unwearable, in spite of being properly greased.

None of those boots had been worn longer than three weeks. They were largely, as I have stated, boots that were made after the change in the specifications; that is, they were part of the 40,000 pairs of boots.

Mr. MURPHY: Double-soled boots.

Mr. NESBITT: Yes, double soles. I believe the double sole was approved, but some one said that afterwards there was a reinforcing put on the sole. I do not remember that there was any quilting or any reinforcing done in the order for the 40,000 pairs that had the sole extended back to the heel. There was certainly no quilting done, that is, nails put all over the sole, in the boots that were given to us the other morning from the Ottawa battery, nor was there any reinforcement in the heel. There was an order for the extension of the sole back to the heel, and there was an increase in the price on that account which was perfectly fair and right, and we have no complaint to make on that score. The manufacturers, as was stated, lived substantially up to their contracts. Some of the contractors did not come before us to give evidence; but others came, and swore that their boots were not only as good as the samples, but to a large extent better, and they produced the leather of which the boots were made. The tanners who tanned the leather were also called, and they swore that the leather was perfectly good; but at the same time, the boots on the feet of the soldiers whom I met from time to time did not look to me to be substantial boots. I do not know why, but there is the fact staring you in the face that all the soldiers, officers and men, who gave evidence, complained that the boots were not proper boots. What is the Government going to do in regard to the matter? The Government had a little more than a month from the time of the first issue of boots to the time when the second order was given, which was ample, in my judgment, for it to have rectified anything that might have been wrong in the boots.

Mr. F. B. McCURDY (Shelburne-Queens): The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) has referred the members of this House to the evidence produced before the committee which is on record. With even greater confidence I also refer the members of the House to the sworn evidence which is on record, because I be-

lieve it will convince any one with an unbiased mind that the majority report of the committee is founded on fact and cannot be controverted in any essential detail.

All who are interested in public affairs should be anxious in every way possible to discourage dishonest public dealings. In this, it appears to me, there are two attitudes to be avoided; first, that of condoning shady transactions; and, second, of almost equal importance, that of condemning honest transactions.

At the present time, and in the present circumstances, in considering the question of the supply of boots to the Canadian Militia Department, we should exercise an impartial, sane and deliberate judgment based entirely upon facts.

We must remember that criticism of army footwear is as old as war itself. Each campaign by a belligerent country is fought under conditions differing from those of its predecessors, so that after the termination of each campaign each belligerent country naturally reviews the experience of that campaign and ascertains in what ways its boots and other war equipment can be improved. The result is that there is constant change and difference of opinion.

The speakers who have preceded me this afternoon have pointed out that the question of army footwear has occupied the attention of the best minds in the United States, and that an experienced army board there required four years in which to make up its mind as to the best form of boot to be recommended. It is only within the last week that, in reading trade journals published in the United States, I find that there is an opinion in the trade there that these findings, although made as late as 1912, have already become obsolete, and that there should be now a change in their army boot.

The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) quoted the evidence of a Canadian manufacturer to the effect that the Canadian Militia Department could easily have made a change from the present specification and ordered different boots within a week. I think I need only point out to him—for he is a man well endowed with discretion—that if the expert American Army Board required four years in which to gather sufficient information to form the basis for an opinion, any suggestion of an interested manufacturer in Canada that a new sample could be supplied and a new specification adopted in a week, is not one that should carry weight with him.

Mr. NESBITT: If the hon. gentleman will change that and, instead of saying that they required that time, will say that they took it, I will agree with him.

Mr. McCURDY: My hon. friend has had a good deal of experience with and ample opportunity to observe our good neighbours to the south, and I think he will be the last to accuse them of any lack of celerity in their movements, or question their sound business judgment.

The interests involved in the present inquiry are two.

The first is the soldier's comfort, and in that is bound up the question of national protection. No interest which can be put forward is entitled to as much consideration as this.

But only secondary to that is the interest of an important Canadian industry, one which employs directly 23,000 operatives, and which has, in addition, a large number of shareholders. There are at least 23,000 operatives engaged directly in the Canadian boot manufacturing industry, tanning and leather trades. Using the usual basis of computation of five to a family, we find that over 100,000 of the Canadian population are dependent on this great industry. That is an interest which can be considered only secondary to that of the comfort of the soldiers themselves.

There has been, I regret to say, very noticeable in the discussion and consideration of the supply of boots to the Canadian army, a tendency to condemn without investigation. The press and pulpit have leaped at conclusions with insufficient evidence. I fully appreciate that, because my own views had, before I had any official knowledge or investigation, been influenced both by the press and by the pulpit; for I have read one and have listened to the other.

It seems to me that the obligation of members at the present time is to divest themselves entirely of all the original prejudice which may have been created by these or other influences. Evidence should be gathered from the whole field. It is not safe, it is not advisable, to select isolated bits of evidence, casual statements by witnesses who appeared before the committee. The evidence should be taken as a whole. If any one will take the trouble to read through these twenty-six volumes they will be able to form a pretty accurate judgment. I am afraid even though recom-

mended to members of this House, that course will not be generally followed.

But, more than that, I think that any person who wishes to arrive at a judgment with regard to any matter such as this, is better equipped to do so if he were present and heard personally the evidence given by the different witnesses.

I know that it is superfluous to appeal to hon. members of the House for a careful consideration of the facts and of the evidence. I trust and I believe that every person who has the opportunity of serving his country by occupying a seat in this House will not fail to place the best interest of the country and its national prosperity above party and will render a decision on the facts as on record and not on any preconceived idea or any question that has to do with party advantage or interest.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. McCURDY (resuming): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) agrees with the report of the committee to the effect that the contracts have been substantially fulfilled by the manufacturers. These reports, I trust, will dispose of the statements which have been going around in the press and which have interfered not a little with the shoe manufacturing industry in Canada. It has been semi-officially stated that substantial contracts from belligerent countries have been cancelled owing to statements made in the press as to the failure of Canadian contractors to carry out their contracts with the department.

The investigation which has been conducted by your committee has been most thorough in all its details. A number of members of this House have occasionally attended that committee, and I am sure their observations will bear out this statement, that nothing in the way of evidence has been ruled out on a technicality, but that, on the contrary, all the rules of evidence, and the practice of previous committees, have been strained to allow anything that in any way could throw light on the matter of boot contracts to be admitted.

Naturally I regret the failure of the committee to arrive at a unanimous report. Unanimity was, I think, particularly desirable at the present time, affecting a question with which is involved that of national defence. The cordial and harmonious relations of members of the committee throughout the investigation seemed to promise, to the uninitiated at any rate, a unanimous report. But other counsels prevailed and we have not a unanimous report, but a report of the majority and a report of the minority, the latter, I feel, not warranted by a fair consideration of the evidence.

It is, however, gratifying that all agree on the essential part, and this gives the lie to the lurid press and pulpit utterances of paper soles and all other fraudulent suggestions—all agree that the boots supplied have been manufactured honestly and in accordance with the contracts.

Furthermore, it has been shown by the investigation that the profits of manufacturers have in all cases been very moderate. The largest manufacturers whom we have had before us and, therefore, presumably the manufacturers best qualified to manufacture at a low cost, testified (see 978 and 980) that the net factory cost, including factory overhead of the boots manufactured at the largest factory, that of the Ames-Holden Company, amounted to $3.39 per pair. They also stated that the overhead expenses of that factory amounted to 19.02 per cent of the selling price, which would be approximately 63 cents per pair. That overhead expense includes audit, advertising, allowances, cartage, donations, insurance, law costs, light, heat and power branches, office sundries, wages (branches), travelling expenses, rent of branches, taxes, stationery, discount, bank interest, repairs, and bad debts, but does not include interest on capital. This will bring the total cost over $3.85, so they appear to have been manufactured and supplied to the Government without any actual profit to the manufacturer. It is also fair to state that one manufacturer alone said before the committee that, even after paying what he called his selling expenses, a profit remained to the manufacturer of 25 cents per pair. But on the occasion when he next appeared before the committee he gave evidence to the effect that his profits were less than 13 cents a pair, and he furthermore, I am informed, made statements not in his evidence to the effect that there was an actual loss on the contract. I think it is a fair statement to make that in no case were any profits of any substantial size made on these contracts.

As to the evidence which has been offered to the committee, my hon. friend from North Oxford has told the House of his personal efforts to investigate. I think all members of the committee have taken pains to go outside the committee room, wherever occasion offered, to observe the condition of the boots on soldiers' feet in actual service, and informal conversations with soldiers and all other means available were employed by the different members of the committee in order to widen the information available.

Reference has been made by every speaker who has preceded me to the regimental boards of inquiry. When the evidence obtained by these regimental boards at the different headquarters first came to my attention, I was of the opinion that the evidence of these boards should be admitted; but it was otherwise decided by the committee. Five members of the committee were leading barristers, and we also had the benefit of counsel, and so six learned barristers decided, probably correctly, that they were not admissible as evidence, for the same reason as the findings of the departmental board of inquiry, sometimes known as the Hallick Board, was not admitted. The principal reason why this was not admitted was that the witnesses had not been sworn; and as the evidence had not been given under oath it was thought by a majority of the committee that the testimony taken before these regimental boards and the Hallick Board should not be received as evidence. Furthermore, with regard to the departmental board, there was always a temptation from being interested, which would be difficult for any departmental officer to fully avoid.

Regimental boards, are held at each of the different divisional headquarters and regimental headquarters of the troops. When new boots were required for any reason by the soldiers, as was explained in evidence, the only way in which these boots could be obtained was through a regimental board. If the regimental board appointed under the authority of the colonel of the regiment condemned the boots for any other reason than ordinary wear and tear, soldiers could not obtain new boots unless they paid for them themseives.

The function of the regimental boards, therefore, can perhaps be properly stated to be the condemnation of boots. I am sure that all can understand the temptation to which the officers were subjected to approve of the applications made by their soldiers for new footwear. If the board found the boots to be no longer useful on account of fair wear and tear, they recommended that the boots be replaced at the public expense. If the boots were rendered unwearable for other reasons they had to be replaced at the soldier's expense. It is only natural that an officer should try to meet the wishes of his men as far as possible, and if possible, confirm the applications that their soldiers had made.

We made inquiry of the regular departmental officers at Ottawa, and examined among others the director of clothing and equipment, who has particular charge of all the outfits for the men. We wished to ascertain whether he accepted the findings of these regimental boards as final. His evidence is to be found on page 232:

Q. You do not accept the recommendations at all?—A. No.

Q. As a matter of fact you regard them with suspicion?—A. I am afraid we do.

Q. They have been more often rejected than acted upon? A. Yes.

Q. In other words it is the natural desire of the men to get new boots as often as they can?—A. Just so.

Furthermore, it should be remembered that those who gave evidence before these boards, and the members of the boards themselves, were not experts in equipment and their examination of the boots was often casual. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) made a good deal of the findings of these boards this afternoon. As I have already stated, their findings were not admitted in the evidence for the reason that those who appeared before the boards as witnesses were not sworn.

But there was also another reason.

When the majority of the members of the committee decided that we could not accept the evidence taken before these regimental boards we scanned the evidence very carefully and summoned before the committee twenty-six witnesses, I think it was, whose evidence in regard to the service given by the boots was the most unfavourable taken by all these regimental boards. These witnesses came before us and gave evidence under oath; but even here we were at a disadvantage for it was only natural that these men should, for the sake of being consistent, seek to uphold in their evidence before the committee the statements they had already made before the regimental board.

As a matter of fact, as subsequent events proved, these regimental boards discharged with a vengeance the functions for which they were created. I have already quoted the evidence of the director of clothing and equipment who said that he always regards the findings of these boards with suspicion, and more often rejects than accepts them. The result of our examination of the witnesses who had appeared before these regimental boards was exactly what was to be expected. It proved the statements made before the regimental boards to be palpably absurd.

The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) referred this afternoon to the case of nine pairs of boots which came before the committee from the 7th Artillery Brigade of Ottawa. This regimental board happened to be called towards the end of the Special Committee's sittings, and when its finding came to our attention we asked that the boots be sent to the committee, and that Lieutenant Patterson and Captain McParland appear to give evidence. It developed in the course of the evidence that of these nine pairs which had been condemned by that regimental board out of a total issue of 267 pairs, two pairs—and this is the evidence of my own senses, for I saw the boots myself; and I am confirmed by the opinion of the committee's experts—were actually wearable at the time they appeared before the committee, and our boot expert naturally asked the question: "Why are these boots condemned? That boot as it stands to-day is perfectly wearable." Three other pairs out of the nine were perfectly repairable, and only required the services of a regimental cobbler to be made right again.

Probably the one reason which more than any other contributed to the dissatisfaction with the boots of the troops at the different quarters was that they could only be served with one pair of boots to wear, rain or shine, day or night.

I am not going to quote at any great length from the evidence given by witnesses who appeared before the committee, but we had another officer, Lieutenant Underwood, who came from the Winnipeg division. This man gave evidence before a departmental board held at the agricultural college barracks in the city of Winnipeg on the 11th January, 1915, and this is his story there as we have it from a perusal of the report of their regimental board:

> I have taken at haphazard a number of pairs of boots of the first issue, which were returned to Q.M. stores, and on cutting them open found them composed of "paper, wood, cork and leather scrap, ground and mixed with glue." The uppers of inferior quality, and in my opinion, unfit for active service.

That officer was brought before the committee, and he admitted that it was news to him that in the manufacture of boots ground cork and cement are recognized as the best filling for Goodyear welt boots, and are required by the specifications of the department. Yet that is his evidence.

The hon. member for Russell this afternoon quoted the evidence of two soldiers only who preferred the British boot to the Canadian boot. We had before us five or six Canadians who enlisted and who saw service at Salisbury Plain. The only members of the Canadian force available to us were asked to appear before the committee and give evidence, and they were unanimous in declaring that they preferred the Canadian boot to the British boot. The opinion of these six men, to my mind, far overruled the opinion of the two privates, McGarvie and Ewing, who were quoted by the hon. member for Russell this afternoon. So far as opinions go with reference to the quality of the boots, the committee, I think very wisely, put their reliance on a committee of experts. After careful deliberation and a good deal of consideration extending over ten days, the committee unanimously decided to select Mr. John A. Hoar, of Halifax, a large custom boot maker, of 30 years experience who had made boots for Imperial officers and soldiers, for naval officers and for the general custom trade, and Mr. Magloire Côté of St. Hyacinthe, who also has large experience from his youth up in boot making, to assist them in an expert way. These two men, I understand, are one on either side of politics. They were unanimously appointed by the committee and, as I say, I think, the committee wisely decided to commit to them the investigation of the condition of the boots which had come to the committee for examination. Their figures have been given to the House a number of times this afternoon, but perhaps they will bear repeating. Immediately on the assembling of the committee, telegrams were sent to all the regimental headquarters

throughout the country asking them to send all rejected boots to Ottawa so that the committee could pass upon them definitely. As a result of these directions 1,713 pairs of boots were sent to the committee as being boots condemned after fair wear and tear by regimental boards. I have previously referred to the findings of these boards as being such as perhaps should not be regarded as conclusive. This opinion has been very much fortified by the developments which have occurred and by the examination of these boots by our experts. They reported that 1,448 out of the 1,713 condemned boots were repairable. They reported further that 112 pairs of these boots had been burned. Every one knows that the burning of boots is not destruction by fair wear and tear. The regimental boards said not a word, any of them, about burning, but burnt they were. Therefore, you have conclusive evidence that the findings of these regimental boards are not such as should be depended upon. There were 22 cut by knife and spur and 48 cut by nails. Out of a total lot we will put those cut by nails in the class of boots unrepairable and destroyed by wear and tear and then we have left only 131 out of the 1,713 sent here for inspection, which shows that the regimental boards were wrong in their decisions in 92 cases out of every 100, and right in only 8 cases out of 100. Surely these results justify the decision of the committee not to accept the findings of the regimental boards as evidence and I am rather surprised that in this discussion my hon. friends opposite should have referred time and time again to the findings of these boards which have been already discarded.

The experience of quite a number of soldiers at Salisbury Plain was given in person to the committee, and I submit that the same rules of evidence should apply to the Salisbury boards as was applied to the regimental boards in Canada. In view of what we found in regard to the credibility of evidence given before the Canadian regimental boards, and the developments which have occurred since we examined the witnesses, considerable reserve should be maintained in regard to these Salisbury boards. Those who gave evidence before the Salisbury boards were almost all, without exception, not sworn. Furthermore, all the soldiers who had experience at Salisbury Plain, without any exception whatever, on coming before our committee testified in the most emphatic manner that they would not wear the English boots but that they preferred the Canadian boots. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) this afternoon, was very insistent on having the letters received from General Alderson, who was in charge of the Canadian force at Salisbusy, read to the House. Whatever Gen. Alderson's opinion may be, it was necessarily based largely, as were the findings of the regimental boards in Canada, on evidence submitted to him and he would not necessarily express his own opinion nor could he state of his own personal knowledge; but he would give a report based on evidence which was sent up to him by those in authority under him.

We all know that every country has its own particular customs, and every good citizen of a country loves the customs of his country and is prepared to stand by them. We, as good Canadians, prefer Canadian things, and the people of Great Britain, as good Britishers, prefer British things, and it should be borne in mind in considering the expression of General Alderson as well as the evidence of Mr. McGarvie and Mr. Ewing, who preferred the British boot, that they have been accustomed to the British boots from their youth up, and that they would naturally favour them.

I shall now deal for a few minutes with the unfair features, as I regard them, of the minority report.

I have already stated that in my innocence, on going into this committee first, I really hoped for a unanimous finding. I went into the committee to consider this question at first under the impression, on account of the utterances in pulpit and press, that a great wrong had been done. I felt very strongly that all evidence possible that could throw light on the subject should be admitted, and I state now that after full consideration of the evidence I am prepared to stand by the report submitted by the committee as being a fair report, and a report warranted by the facts in their widest sense. If the minority report contains unfair features, and many unfair features, it is perhaps because of the fact that certain members have gone into that committee from the very start to if possible report something unfavourable to and tending to reflect on the Government. I went into that committee with no such intention; I went there with no other intention but to give my verdict exactly according to the evidence. As a sample of what I consider unfair findings, I shall read from page 599 of the Votes and Pro-

ceedings, paragraphs 43 and 44 of the minority report:

> Thirteen hundred and sixty-five pairs of boots, and three hundred and forty-eight odd boots out of the number condemned by the various boards throughout the country were submitted to the inspection of Messrs John A. Hoar, of Halifax, and Magloire Côté of St. Hyacinthe, who made report thereon, as follows:
>
> That out of said number of boots, two hundred and sixty-five pairs were not worth repairing; fourteen hundred and forty-eight were repairable, and that sixty-eight boots were not originally equal to the sample. If the proportion of boots in this particular lot, not equal to sample, is a fair percentage of the number of boots furnished that did not come up to sample, out of the one hundred and eighty thousand pairs supplied, the number of boots so furnished that were inferior to sample would be seven thousand two hundred and ninety-eight boots.

If that second paragraph of the minority report which I have read means anything, it means that Mr. John A. Hoar and Mr. Coté found:

> If the proportion of boots in this particular lot, not equal to sample, is a fair percentage of the number of boots furnished that did not come up to sample, out of the one hundred and eighty thousand pairs supplied, the number of boots so furnished that were inferior to sample would be seven thousand two hundred and ninety-eight boots.

As a matter of fact, Messrs. Hoar and Coté found nothing of the kind, and the wording of that paragraph must create a most erroneous impression upon the mind of any reader. To my mind, and I think to the mind of any impartial man who reads it, it is intended to convey an entirely wrong impression as to the finding of these two gentlemen who were appointed as experts by the committee. The first sentence alone of the paragraph, not the second or last, is that of Messrs. Hoar and Coté. And the representation is the more unfair because these boots are the "dregs" of the whole issues, and thus inevitably yield a larger proportion of bad boots than those not condemned.

Reference has been made to the evidence of Mr. Alfred Minister of Toronto, and is regarded as of so much importance by the minority of the committee that it occupies a whole paragraph in their report. It is stated in this minority report that Mr. Minister would not make shoes according to the sample, knowing that they were to be used by men going on active service, and the impression is conveyed that "he did not want to make any money out of a man's life." Citations from the evidence of Mr. Minister have been made by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), and any person who reads that evidence in its entirety will recognize at once that it is most contradictory, and that it destroys the point which the minority report seeks to make out of it. In my opinion, too great weight ought not to be attached to the evidence of this man. His evidence, in the first place, was intended to make it appear that because of his high sense of public duty he was willing to forego profits which he might have made, because he did not want to take advantage of the situation. But he was obliged to admit before the committee, first that he would make the selfsame boots if he got his price of $4.65, and, second, that he took no further steps whatever to notify the Government or those responsible of the ideas he expresses at this date of defects; that he sent no word to the Minister of Militia or to his member of Parliament as to his views on the subject.

Another paragraph in the minority report which cannot fail to attract the attention of any one who has followed the evidence carefully, is paragraph 21, which is to be found at page 596 of the Votes and Proceedings and which says:

> That on October 24th the department directed a change to be made in the sample boot by doing away with the slip sole that had been in use and providing in its place a double sole running through to the back of the heel, but made no further changes in the specifications—

It is correct so far, but listen to this:

> —or in the direction of providing a proper boot for active service.

If anything has been shown by the investigation as regards boots, it is that the trouble is on account of the soles wearing out. A large number of boots have been displayed before the committee; and in almost all the cases, the difficulty where it did arise came on that account, and the minority report says that "the Government did nothing in the direction of providing a proper boot for active service, excepting the providing of a double sole." The evidence of Mr. Matthews, of Ames-Holden-McCready Company, at page 584, is as follows:

> Q. I see that this sole also has nails?—A. Yes, hob nails.
>
> Q. Would there be any difficulty in putting these steel slugs and these nails in the sole after manufacture?—A. After manufacture?
>
> Q. Yes?—A. There would be no difficulty in putting in hob nails. Since the investigation was started, the Canadian Government has sent to our factory in the neighbourhood of 8,000 shoes to be reinforced, or quilted as we call it, in the fore-part and in the heels with nails.

The Government has sent to one factory alone 8,000 pairs to be reinforced or quilted in the sole, which is the most vulnerable part of the boot. I need only draw the attention of the members of the committee to the matter, and they will recognize that there has been a cloud of witnesses who have produced boots that have been quilted in the soles, and that one firm alone has put those improvements in the soles of 8,000 pairs of boots.

Mr. NESBITT: Were not those boots sent back from the Montreal stores?

Mr. McCURDY: The evidence does not show where they came from. Why, in the face of this well-known fact should the minority report say that " nothing has been done by the Government in the way of providing a proper boot for active service "? Hon. members on the other side of the House may palliate the omission of the minority report to commend the vigilance of the department, but no hon. member can excuse the minority for such a palpable misstatement as the one to which I have referred.

The most amazing statement, however, and one which occurs no less than fifteen times in the minority report is that the boots which have been served out to the soldiers "are not active service boots." That is the burden of the song from beginning to end of the minority report. I was much disappointed at the failure of the committee to agree on a report, and it looks to me as though the hon. gentlemen who have submitted the minority report had early made up their minds to bring in an adverse report, which is not founded on the facts disclosed. The minority, after searching the whole record through, find that in their opinion the boot is not an active service boot, and they fasten on this point and reiterate from one end of the report to the other that the boot is not an active service boot.

It has been pointed out to the House already—and I will repeat it, as it is a matter of importance—that whatever the recognized departmental pattern boot may be, it was adopted in the days when the Minister of War of our hon. friends opposite presided over the Department of Militia and Defence. Whether the boot came into the department in 1899, 1900, 1905 or 1908, matters not; it was there, an accepted pattern by the department at the time when this Government came into power, and when hon. gentlemen opposite —and it is only they who join in this minority report—condemn the active service boot, they condemn their own administration of the Department of Militia.

I would have expected my hon. friends opposite to have been more kind to the gallant gentleman who lately presided over that department.

This country has voted large sums of money year after year for the upkeep of the Department of Militia. In 1897, $1,688,213 was spent; in 1898, $2,500,635; in 1899, $3,624,693; in 1900, $3,106,241; and so on down to the year 1907, $6,795,678; in 1908, $6,408,806; in 1909, $6,921,314, and in 1910, $6,909,211. This money was voted by the representatives of the people, assuming that it was to be spent for the purpose of keeping the permanent force in a state of readiness to defend this country, and engage in serious fighting if necessary.

Did it ever occur to the Canadian people that this money, instead of being spent in equipping the permanent force for active service, was to be spent in holding annual camps where honourary colonels might appear in full uniform once a year without any serious thoughts of fighting in their minds?

We all remember the experiences of our youthful navy, how one-half of it on returning from a junketing trip, ran on the rocks. Do I understand from this minority report that it was deliberately planned by hon. gentlemen opposite and by the late Minister of War that we were to have a toy army as well as a toy navy?

The argument of the hon. member for North Oxford is that this boot is an active service boot suitable for South Africa, but not suitable for France. If that suggestion is followed to its logical conclusion, then Canada should immediately equip itself with a variety of kinds of army boot. She should have one suitable for South Africa; she should have one suitable for France, the country where our men now are: one suitable for work in Belgium, for that is where they will be shortly; we should have one suitable for work in Germany, for that is where our forces will be soon; and so on ad infinitum; she should have boots suitable for use in every country on which she may at any time wage a war.

It is quite clear from the evidence that a boot very similar to exhibit 12 was worn by soldiers in South Africa. It seems clear that Slater boots were not provided by the department, but soldiers who wanted them had to buy their own boots.

But I should like to show to the House a sample of the real South African army boot, provided by the Administration

under the superintendence of the late Minister of Militia and Defence. There [exhibiting a boot] is a fair specimen of the real boot our soldiers wore in South Africa provided by the department. It is a fair sample—exhibit no. 77.

An hon. MEMBER: What is that in the sole?

Mr. McCURDY: Cardboard—sometimes referred to as paper—in the sole from end to end—a fair sample of the boot that the Minister of War of my friends opposite provided for our soldiers for South Africa. If they did not like it, they could go to soldiers out with a booth of this kind? with their own money. I invite an examination and comparison of these two boots. If hon. gentlemen opposite condemn this Government for sending soldiers abroad with a boot of that kind, exhibit No. 12 [exhibiting another boot], what will they say about a minister of war sending his soldiers out with a boot of this kind [exhibiting the first boot].

Mr. MACDONALD: That is absolutely untrue, and the hon. member knows that. That boot was rejected.

Mr. McCURDY: The hon. gentleman says the statement is untrue. That comes as news to me.

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman had better read the evidence.

Mr. McCURDY: I have read the evidence.

Mr. MACDONALD: You will find that that is a sample of the boot that was rejected by the inspector in 1899. It was made by Robert Taylor & Co., in Halifax. You will find the correspondence produced by Mr. McCann which will show that these boots were rejected and returned. And they were not intended for South Africa in the first place.

Mr. McCURDY: I refer to the evidence of Mr. McCann with regard to these boots. This boot is called exhibit 77. I am not at all surprised that my hon. friend from Pictou is very much annoyed when attention is called to this boot and its history in the department.

9 p.m.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am annoyed at my hon. friend misrepresenting the facts.

Mr. McCURDY: I quote from the evidence of Mr. McCann, page 1038:

We opened up that one boot and it was quite unnecessary to destroy any more boots. We had that as one sample. We just took it at random, opened it, and the moment it was opened we concluded that it was not just what our minister wanted to send away.

Then, at page 1,039:

Q. Then those that came in subsequently were from the same contractor and were the same kind of boots?—A. Practically the same kind.

Q. And they were for the permanent force in South Africa?—A. And for South Africa.

It is quite true, some of these boots were returned to the contractor. But this is a fair sample of the boot used at that time in the department; and I would advise my hon. friend, before he makes other positive statements with regard to that boot, to go to Halifax and personally investigate and inquire from his friends as to the subsequent history of the boot.

Mr. MACDONALD: Investigate among your friends, Robert Taylor & Co.

Mr. McCURDY: I trust that both Robert Taylor & Co. and Hon. A. W. Redden are friends of mine. I am a friend of theirs. It was the hon. gentleman himself who pointed out to the committee—however, I will refer to that later on. The point is that this is a fair sample of the boot sent to South Africa.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It says it was this class of boot.

Mr. McCURDY: It was this class of boot, and no quibbling will dispose of that. Furthermore, the present Government are paying $3.85 a pair for boots for our soldiers, and we are told that the Government is not prepared to pay for a good boot; but all that the former Government were prepared to pay for boots for our soldiers going to South Africa was $2.13 a pair. As to the evidence of Mr. McCann, let me follow it a little further, quoting from page 1039:

By the Chairman:

Q. Then those that came in subsequently were from the same contractor, and were the same kind of boot?—A. Practically the same kind.

Q. And they were for the permanent force and for South Africa.—A. And for South Africa.

Q. And possibly some of them went to South Africa?—A. It is quite possible.

Q. It is quite probable, is it not?—A. I would not like to go that far.

Mr. Macdonald: The lot of boots of which this is a sample were all rejected and sent back to the contractor, and therefore this is not evidence.

Hon. Mr. Murphy: And he said that many of the men who went to South Africa bought their own boots.

By the Chairman:

Q. Those who did not wore this class of boot?—A. So far as I know, some of them might have gone to South Africa.

By Hon. Mr. Murphy:

Q. Do you know that as a fact?—A. I do not know as a fact; once they were accepted they were returned to the Ordnance Stores.

By the Chairman:

Q. Those who went to South Africa did not buy their own boots, nor this class of boots?—A. It was this kind that went to South Africa.

That settles the question. Where is my hon. friend's charge of misrepresentation now?

I deplore the fact that such an important question, one with which is involved Canadian national and Imperial defence, should be made a party question.

There are, as you know, in the prosecution of a fight, certain rules of civilized warfare; some things are permissible and some are not permissible. Among the acts not permitted in modern warfare is the poisoning of wells. I had sent to me a few days ago—I do not know whether on account of my official position as member of the committee; at any rate it came to me through the mails—a publication called "No. 24." I see that it is published by the Central Information Bureau of the Canadian Liberal Party, Ottawa, 1915. This publication, which bears the official impress of the Liberal party said:

The manufacturers made the shoes that were ordered. If the wrong sort were ordered, the fault lay with the Government, and that is where the fault did lie. They waited three weeks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the evidence produced by that committee shows that war was declared on the 4th of August. The first business day following the 4th of August was the 5th of August. On the 8th of August, three days later, the Government sent out requisitions to a large number of manufacturers, and on the 10th of August, which was exactly five days after it was possible for them to act, contracts for the manufacture of boots were in the contractors' hands—and still we have from this official bureau that the Government "waited three weeks." I have already declared that we have heard from the pulpit and from the press wild statements with regard to the supply of boots and their quality. I think this little leaflet can properly excuse about one-half of the press of this country from any liability in this matter; this is the quarter from which official information springs for the Liberal party. No fountain can rise higher than its source, and if this is the official information—misinformation, distorted information, given out by the central bureau at Ottawa,—it seems to me that the fault lies there with the Liberal party, and not primarily with the press who are supporting it.

The minority report also devotes a paragraph to the middleman:

That in the month of November last the Militia Department directed the Senior Ordnance Officer to purchase boots locally in Winnipeg and 3,798 pairs of boots were purchased there, not directly from manufacturers of boots but through middlemen;

These boots were required for use at Winnipeg, they were purchased at Winnipeg from large wholesale dealers in Winnipeg because there are no manufacturers there, and it does not appear from the evidence produced before the committee that the public interest has suffered in any way whatever. The boots were delivered at Winnipeg at $4 per pair, express paid, delivered free of expense to the Government and the public interest has not suffered. Furthermore, these 3,798 pairs of boots are less than 2·10 per cent of the whole supply of boots ordered since the war broke out.

It is rather significant that the minority report calls attention to the fact that these purchases were made through middlemen—and stopped there. Do hon. gentlemen opposite condemn the existence of middlemen, this noxious weed of Liberal growth, or do they hesitate to attack this class whose activities flourished throughout the country in the days of hon. gentlemen opposite? Do they intend to uproot them? It is significant that they call attention to the fact that these middlemen exist and make no recommendation with regard to them.

Our casual research in the department brought us face to face with this institution, fostered—and I say it in all sincerity—by the late Administration. When our search in the department uncovered this institution, it was, in fact, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) himself who first recognized it. The contract for army boots in 1889 was made with Mr. A. W. Redden, a leading citizen of Halifax, a member of the Legislative Council and a man of the highest standing. He is a stalwart Liberal, of course, else he would not have been called when he was to the "upper chamber" in Nova Scotia. But Mr. Redden is a retail dealer. The Winnipeg dealers who supplied the boots questioned by the minority are all wholesalers.

The significance of the Redden contract did not dawn on the majority of the com-

mittee, it remained for the hon. member for Pictou to point it out. The hon. member said (page 1200):

> Mr. Macdonald: I may state for the benefit of the committee that Mr. Robert Taylor was one of the people who made that boot with the paper sole that was produced here.

We were content to let the matter rest with Mr. Redden, but the hon. member for Pictou was the means of pointing out that there was a middleman in the transaction.

While it does not appear from our investigation that the public interest has suffered, there is one other circumstance in connection with the supply of army boots which, I think, should not be overlooked. It also is a legacy from bygone days. There was a gentleman well known around the department who formerly was president of the Slater Shoe Company, who dealt largely with the department in the olden days when Sir Frederick Borden presided over that department. In those days it was not fashionable to call for tenders. Mr. Slater was awarded the contract year after year without any call for tenders. The order was simply given out to Mr. Slater. This gentleman ceased his connection with the Slater Shoe Company on January 1, 1913. Within two months he had appealed to the Minister of Militia and Defence for consideration on the false representation that he had become a partner in Louis Gauthier & Co., a manufacturing concern in Quebec. The minister, with his customary good nature, allowed this gentleman an opportunity to tender.

Major General HUGHES: I might say right here that no man who is a manufacturer of boots who has ever had his name presented to the Militia Department since I have been there, be he Grit or Tory, reputable or otherwise, but has had his name put on the list and has had the director of contracts search him out to see whether he was fit for the job or not.

Mr. McCURDY: The minister's statement brings to my mind other information we found in the committee. We found that the minister had gone to a great deal of pains to ascertain whether this firm should be allowed to tender. Exhaustive reports were at his direction obtained from the mercantile agencies, who reported that this firm of Louis Gauthier & Co., in which Slater claimed to be a partner, was a reputable and reliable firm, well able to carry out a contract if given an opportunity to tender. At any rate, they were subsequently the lowest tenderers, at $3.72½, and as such were awarded the contract for the supply of boots.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend has said that the Slater Company got the contract without tendering. What was the price?

Mr. McCURDY: I think it was $4.

Mr. NESBITT: I understand the highest price was $3.72.

Mr. McCURDY: Here is the evidence on page 903. Charles E. Slater was being examined as regards the Gauthier contract:

> Q. Then you ought to have no objection to tell us.—A. Instead of it causing the Government or the Department any more expense, I saved them money by my connection with Gauthier, and bringing Gauthier into the proposition. In 1913 and 1912 we were paying $4 a pair for the boots. That was the year, 1912, when Slater Shoe Co. supplied the boots.

So that on the first Gauthier contract the country was saved 27½ cents per pair. It has not been proven by the investigation that the public interest has suffered at all in the matter, but at the same time our investigations disclosed the fact that an abnormal and unfair commission arrangement existed; and although the public interest has not suffered in any way by reason of it, I think the Government, now that its attention had been brought to the matter, can very properly place its stamp of disapproval upon any such arrangement in connection with its business in the future.

It must be very gratifying to all citizens who are anxious for a full and free investigation into the public transactions that the evidence of the committee should be as it is.

It should also be gratifying to all interested in the fortunes of the soldiers who are so valiantly battling at the front in defence of our common cause, and gratifying as well as to every Canadian interested in the vindication of our great industrial structure, upon whose prosperity depends in turn the prosperity of a large army of employees and skilled mechanics.

In closing, I desire to express the hope that the agencies which have been instrumental in creating uneasiness in the minds of those who have sons or brothers or friends at the front—and that includes all Canadians—and which have been so ready to cast aspersions upon the fair name of one of Canada's great basic industries, may, now that the baseless nature of their charges has been demonstrated, be equally active in removing the false impression which they assisted in creating.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): As a member of the committee to which was referred the question as to the character of the boots supplied by the Government to the overseas contingent, I feel it my duty to make a few remarks; and I should like to review very shortly the conditions which existed in regard to this whole matter of the supplying of boots by the Canadian Government not only to the volunteers for overseas service, but to the permanent force as well. We have had some very curious statements and reasoning by some of the hon. gentlemen who, in defence of the rather curious document that has been presented as the majority report, have gone very far afield indeed from the evidence which was presented before the committee. They have discussed almost everything else in the world except the question as to the character of the boots that were given to the soldiers. I might recall the fact that previous to 1899 the number of men permanently engaged in the Militia Force of Canada was comparatively small, amounting to not more than 700 or 800 at the most; and these were scattered at various places over the country at what were known as schools of instruction, where young men who wanted to qualify as Canadian officers proceeded for the purpose of taking a course and receiving their certificates. Previous to 1899, in no one year from Confederation down, was the Militia Department of Canada called on to supply more than 700 or 800 pairs of boots at one time. It will readily be seen, therefore, that the question of the character of boots supplied during that period was not a matter of very serious consequence. It did not engage the attention of the country to a very great degree, for a large number of these men were employed simply as sentries in the quietest kind of way, and had no real part in actual training. When the militia of the country were called out to the camps in summer time the Government of the country at no time, since Confederation down to the present, has ever provided them with boots. Each man provided himself with his own. I thought it well to make these remarks because I am quite sure that a great number of people who have not followed the procedure of the committee, or read the evidence, were under the impression that the Government had in the past been supplying the boots for the militia of this country.

With these premises, let us see where Canada was in 1899 when she decided to participate in the South African war. The result was that the organization of the department, so far as the supplying of boots for any purposes was concerned, was naturally of no consequential character, and from the evidence before us there can be no manner of doubt that the Canadian force that went to South Africa were equipped with boots in this way. In the first place Lord Strathcona sent the Strathcona Horse and equipped them with everything that attached to a soldier's accoutrements, the department supplying no part of their equipment whatever. It appears that the Vankleek Hill Boot and Shoe Company supplied the major portion of the boots that were purchased by the Militia Department in 1899 for the men who went to South Africa.

Major General HUGHES: Did I understand the hon. member to say that the Strathcona Horse were the first that were sent to South Africa?

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not say who was sent first. I said that the Strathcona Horse were equipped by Lord Strathcona himself. I am speaking of the evidence that is before us, and I do not want my hon. friend the General when his turn comes to speak to bring to the House any data that may be in his department but which was not submitted to the committee. If my hon. friend has any evidence in regard to this or anything else that was before the committee, he should have submitted it to the committee to whom was committed the task of dealing with this question.

Major General HUGHES: I am very much obliged for the lecture. But where was the suggestion that I was suppressing anything?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend has shown a disposition to be rather exceptional in his criticism of matters concerning the Strathcona Horse, so I ventured to give him that little suggestion, which I hope he will accept. He is too old a parliamentarian not to accept a suggestion of that kind. The Vankleek Hill Boot and Shoe Company was the one which supplied the boots which went to South Africa. But a great many men who volunteered at that time purchased their own boots. That was given in evidence by some gentlemen who appeared before us and has been confirmed from various other sources.

I was very much surprised to see the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. McCurdy), who, all through this inquiry and down to the very last moment of the drafting of this

majority report, was of the opinion that these boots were not suitable for active service, drag into this issue the question of a boot that was produced before the committee and alleged to be a sample of the kind of boot that was sent to South Africa. I asked Mr. McCann, who is assistant director general of contracts:

Q. Have you got a pattern of that 1,900 South African boot? You have not got a sample boot?—A. I do not think there is one in existence.

And he goes on to say in other parts of his evidence that he had searched in the department and could not find any boot of that kind. Then, as suggested by my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), his examination proceeds in this way:

By Mr. McCurdy:

Q. Why were the boots rejected if not because they were not according to sample?—A. I could not tell if it was according to sample or not.

Q. I understand you to say the boots were rejected?—A. Some of them were rejected because they were found like that (pointing to boot). That was not considered a suitable boot to go either to the Permanent Force or to South Africa.

He identifies this particular boot which the hon. member for Shelburne has produced here. The correspondence produced by Mr. McCann will be found at page 1060. It will be found that Mr. A. W. Redden, of the city of Halifax, who was a boot and shoe dealer, and, as it was disclosed afterwards, connected with Robert Taylor & Co., who were boot and shoe manufacturers in the city of Halifax, tendered for the supply of boots for the Permanent Force in that year, and that this boot was one of the samples which had been sent forward in connection with the supply of boots to the Permanent Force, as explained by Mr. McCann at page 1030 of the evidence. The question was asked:

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. Were there any specifications for that boot at that time?—A. No.

Q. There had been none in the department?—A. No, that was made to sample, and for anything I know to the contrary, the sample may have been made exactly like that.

Q. You say there were 3,000 pairs of boots. What became of those boots?—A. I could not tell you that. You would have to find that out from the ordnance people.

Q. They went to the Ordnance Department, did they?—A. Some of them did and some went to the contractors.

Q. Did you show that to Sir Frederick Borden, the then minister?—A. No, I did not. It was shown to him by the then Deputy Minister.

Q. And what was done in regard to it?—A. The boots were rejected and returned to the contractor, that lot.

Q. What about the 3,000 pairs?—A. I could not tell you off-hand.

Q. They were not returned?—A. Some of those were returned too.

Then this witness goes on and produces the correspondence which is found at page 1060 and in which you will find that Captain Benoit, director of contracts at that time; wrote to Mr. Redden:

Ottawa, 23rd December, 1899.

A. W. Redden,
Halifax, N.S.

Boots received from you just opened out for inspection. Leather in some, both soles and upper very bad; far inferior to standard and useless for service. Those for South Africa must be of best quality and workmanship. They will be subjected to rigid inspection. Wire explanation fully.

(Sgd.) A. Benoit, Captain.

He had previously written him on the 12th December, 1899, to the following effect:

I now beg leave to inform you that, as the boots will not be required for a second contingent to South Africa, we will have to issue them to our permanent force, who have been wearing a different kind made of brown leather.

On February 13, Captain Benoit, writing to Mr. Redden, says:

Ottawa, February 13, 1900.

Gentlemen,—I beg leave to enclose to you, herewith, a copy of our departmental inspector's report upon 456 pairs of ankle boots we received from you about 15th December last.

You will see from the nature of this report that it was quite impossible that we could accept these boots, 449 pairs, consequently were returned to you on the 2nd instant, via Canada Atlantic and Intercolonial R.R.

The amount of the charges paid for freight to Ottawa from Halifax on the 9 cases of boots —$9.40—will be deducted from any claim you may have against this department for boots accepted from you.

The remaining seven pairs have been kept here for the present for reference.

Among the seven pairs which were kept in the department for reference was found this boot which has been produced here. There was in the filling of this particular boot, according to Mr. McCann, what is known as leatherette. That is what Mr. McCann in his evidence states was in this boot and that was apostrophised by the gentleman who is acting as counsel in this matter as paper and hon. gentlemen have been talking about paper ever since.

Mr. McCURDY: The counter was composed of leatherette, but the soles, as the sample will show, were made of ordinary pasteboard from one end to the other.

Mr. MACDONALD: I speak of the filling. At page 1029 it will be found that Mr. McCann speaks of leatherette as being the

quality of the material used. My hon. friend introduces this matter for the purpose of endeavouring to lead the House and the country to believe that particular boot was one out of a number of boots which had been shown to the committee and that the balance of them had formed part of the boots which had been sent to South Africa.

Mr. McCURDY: A similar boot.

Mr. MACDONALD: A similar boot? Let my hon. friend produce that similar boot. A similar boot has been the refuge of my hon. friend and his friends all through this inquiry. It was not a similar boot. When was this boot supplied?

Mr. McCURDY: This boot was supplied.

Mr. MACDONALD: If my hon. friend had not been so interested in other matters he would have known that Capt. Benoit stated that the boots were being ordered for the Permanent Force and that this was one of the seven pairs of boots that had been kept out of the 456 that had been received, that the balance were rejected and returned and that none of them got to South Africa. These are the boots (exhibiting a pair of boots) which my hon. friend's friends have supplied the soldiers who have gone to fight the Germans. It will take my hon. friend and his friends a long time to explain the shortcomings of this boot without going back into ancient history. If my hon. friend knows anything about Canadian history and about what was done in South Africa he will know that there never was any complaint about the boots which were sent to South Africa during the time when Sir Frederick Borden was Minister of Militia. My hon. friends went hunting in the recesses of the Militia Department and found a boot that was a rejected sample out of 456 boots that were absolutely rejected, which boot happened to remain in the department, and the finding of that boot is regarded by these hon. gentlemen as a good and sufficient answer for boots like those which have been supplied to the soldiers to-day. After all his arguments and after all his labouring about that boot, the very best that my hon. friend and his friends could do, when they put their hands to paper is the following to be found at page 585 of the Votes and Proceedings:

> The evidence does not justify the committee in coming to the conclusion that with some such improvements as have been suggested the sample boot would not be a good, all round, serviceable Canadian military boot.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Is not that a beautiful commendation—that the evidence does not go so far that it would enable us to come to the conclusion that, with some improvements that have been suggested, the sample boot would not be made a good boot! That is the very best they can say about that boot. The improvements have not been made and the deliverance of the majority of the committee on this whole question is that with some improvements they might possibly make a good boot out of it. I commend to my hon. friend the task of wrestling with the question as to whether he could not do better even than that and not be forced to confess that he was driven to the position of taking up that old boot which was found in the recesses of the Militia Department and discussing it as if it had some relevancy to this question at all.

What happened after 1899? In 1901 the department took up the question of the defence of Canada and from that time on the Militia Department were concerned about the supplying of boots for outfitting the men who were looking after the defence of Canada herself. It became necessary to purchase, instead of 700 pairs of boots a year from 7,000 to 8,000. As a consequence, in 1901, a specification was drawn up. In 1905 the first time, as far as the evidence before us goes, Goodyear welt boots were bought by the Department of Militia and Defence.

Mark you, the boots which went to South Africa were standard screw boots and they were a nailed pattern, and for the first time in 1905 the Goodyear welt was introduced into the department. There is all the difference in the world between these boots, and the battle wages between the two schools of men in the boot world, as to whether the Goodyear welt or the standard screw boot is the better for soldiers. We had in three years 7,000 or 8,000 men in barracks in Canada—at Halifax, London, Esquimalt, and elsewhere. They were in small groups and their duties were not arduous; in Halifax they manned the citadel and the forts and they were engaged in schools of instruction, and the Militia Department knew very well that in providing two pairs of boots a year for each soldier they were not providing boots which were fit for active service conditions.

As I have said, there is a great deal of difference between the two kinds of boots. A number of soldiers came before the Committee, some from the permanent force and some from the expeditionary force, and they explained that they liked to have a

nice dressy boot for ordinary occasions, and one chap who had lived in England said there was no use going up to London with a boot that was not dressy, because he never could get a girl, and that the Canadian boot was good for that, but it was not much good for campaigning. In these years, the Militia Department supplied this boot to the man living in barracks, when there was no thought of active service conditions. There is no question about that; every member of committee knows it.

Therefore the paramount question which the committee had to consider was. is the boot which was supplied to the men of the overseas force an adequate and a proper boot for active service conditions. These men were not enlisting to do sentry duty or to go on parade in barracks, but to engage in the most serious warfare the world has ever known. The moment the declaration of war was made, it must have become plain to the Department of Militia that above everything else the boys who were going to the front should be equipped in the best possible manner. A man engaged in this arduous duty might have a hole in his trousers, or the cloth of his coat might be thin, or there might be defects in his overcoat; and he could worry along, but the poor beggar who even in Canada had to train six hours a day, marching through the various evolutions, must have a boot which is comfortable and which will not cause him discomfort and pain. And when you transport him across the ocean and put him up against the task he has to perform in the trenches the absolute necessity for excellence in the character of his footwear becomes imperative. The question for the committee then to consider was, whether or not the boot was a fit boot for active service conditions, and that is the question which the Canadian people want to have answered. If any hon. gentleman opposite could bring evidence to show that it was an adequate and proper active service boot, then the whole discussion ended. If my hon. friend (Mr. McCurdy) was able to point to one piece of evidence that it was a proper boot for active service, we need not have this discussion to-night; but neither he nor any one else has been able to do so. This whole report of the majority of the committee is an absolute apology for the boot which somehow or other got under the feet of our soldiers. In legal parlance, hon. gentlemen on the other side have confessed the allegations and they are trying to avoid the consequence by all sorts of suggestions and learned discussions about the English boot and the American boot, which, of course have no relevancy whatever to the question as to whether or not we supplied our men with the right boot for the purpose it was to be used for. Up to this very moment, no one has come forward to say that this was a proper boot in all respects. When the Minister of Militia first appeared before the committee he impressed me that he would contend that it was a proper boot for active service, but when I read his evidence carefully, I found he told us very plainly that there was something wrong with the toe, and something wrong with the heel, and something wrong elsewhere—

Major General HUGHES: Does the hon. gentleman mean to insinuate that I did not state that to the committee?

Mr. MACDONALD: State what?

Major General HUGHES: State that in the opinion of some it should be better at the toe?

Mr. MACDONALD: I am just saying that you said so. I said that even the Major General did not come to the point of saying that this was an absolutely good boot for active service, and that he pointed out certain defects in it.

Major General HUGHES: Not defects.

Mr. MACDONALD: Inferiorities.

Major General HUGHES: That it might be improved.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Major General will not speak about this boot in the same sense that some people speak about painting the lily, because he said that this lily boot of his could be painted up, and that if it were fixed in the toe and in the heel and in the instep and in the uppers it would be a first-class boot, but that otherwise it was defective. Practically every man who has had to do with manufacturing these boots has condemned them.

We have heard a great deal about the excellence of Mr. Hoar, from Halifax, as an expert. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have lauded him and spoken of him as a man who knew what he was talking about. He comes from the constituency of the Prime Minister, and he was called by hon. gentlemen on the other side and put forward as a man on whose judgment they were going to rely. Let us see what he says about this boot. He was shown the sample boot, Exhibit 12, which was produced by the department, and he was asked:

Would you consider the sample boot, Exhibit 12, a fair boot for ordinary conditions, that is the sample by which the Ames-Holden Company were working.

Mark you, this was the sample boot from which Ames-Holden and Company made all their boots, and Mr. Hoar, before he answered the question, was rather cautious, and he said:

Under what conditions? For city wear or what?

Then he was asked:

Would you consider it so under ordinary conditions of military wear?

And his answer was:

Not for campaign work.

Then I quote further from the evidence:

Q. Would you think it was fit for ordinary military work outside of campaign work?—A. Yes, I would.

Q. But for campaign work, you think a different boot should be used?—A. Yes.

Q. What kind of a boot should be used?—A. A heavier boot.

Then Sir James Aikins asked him:

Q. Would you consider this boot fit for country wear?

Country wear, mark you, and the answer of this expert was:

No, sir.

He would not consider the boot which our boys were to wear in the trenches fit for country wear.

Mr. MURPHY: In Canada?

Mr. MACDONALD: Certainly, in Canada, and he was asked why, and he answered: The sole is not heavy enough." Then he was asked:

What experience have you had in boots for country wear?—A. Country wear?

And he goes on to tell what experience he has had.

Q. Then you would liken country wear to military use. There would be no distinction between country wear and military use?—A. Yes, they would be all right for city wear, but if the military go into the country they want a heavier boot than this.

It is Mr. Pringle who is asking all these questions.

Q. It is not heavy enough for military purposes?—A. Not for campaigning.

Major General HUGHES: Had the witness ever been on a campaign?

Mr. MACDONALD: I have not the military record of every one in this country.

Major General HUGHES: Surely the hon. member asked him.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. MACDONALD: This man stated that he had made military boots in Halifax for military officers and for the men in the garrison all his life.

Mr. NESBITT: For thirty years.

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Hoar was the special selection of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. McCurdy), and was brought up here on purpose to say that the sample boot was a good boot.

Mr. McCURDY: Not for that purpose. I heard that he was brought here to condemn boots.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend was arguing a little while ago in regard to percentages until he got the hon. members present to a point where they could not follow him on the evidence of Mr. Hoar. For my part I want to deal with the whole evidence properly as regards the kernel of the whole matter, which is whether the boot was fit for campaign use or not. Mr. Hoar's evidence is that it is not.

Mr. McCURDY: He said that it was a good boot.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is a great question my hon. friends are always asking witnesses. The witnesses come in and look at the sample boot. It is a pretty boot, just the same kind of boot as every hon. member here wears, but would any of us go far into the woods in the summer time or go marching around the country for five or six hours a day with the boots we wear in the city? Yet that is the sample boot shown. My hon. friends ask the witness: "Is it a good boot?" Answer—"Yes." "Does it look like the other boot?" Answer—"Yes, it looks like the other boot." That is the way in which the thing is done. But I want to go back to the kernel of the whole question, and I make the assertion that there was not a single manufacturer who was asked his opinion about the sample boot who did not condemn it, and that up to this moment no man, including the majority of the committee, has dared to put his signature to a certificate stating that this boot is a good active service boot.

Let us now take the evidence of Mr. J. A. Adams, of the Murray Shoe Company. I will not go into his evidence in detail, but I will call attention shortly to what he says on page 752.

Q. You have seen boots of the style of Exhibit 12, that has been so much talked of here?—A. Yes.

Q. You did not consider they were suitable for active service, and you submitted a boot

that you thought would be suitable; is that it? —A. Yes, that is it.

This gentleman of the Murray Shoe Company did not think the departmental boot was a suitable one, and he said: "I have a boot that I think is better than this and I will make it, but I do not want to make the other one."

Take Mr. Matthews, of the Ames-Holden-McCready Company, of Montreal, who was interviewed by the Shoe and Leather Journal last autumn. In his interview he said that this boot, which was being made for the department and which was being given to the soldiers, was not a boot that was fit for active service at all, and that in his opinion this particular boot was a kind of a light boot that they were using in order to get the men accustomed to marching so that they could wear a heavier boot later on. He reiterated that this boot was not one which was suitable for active service.

Take, not Mr. Charles Slater, but Mr. George A. Slater, one of the bubbling, cheerful kind of chaps, who told the department he would not take $20 a pair to make boots like the sample for men who were going out to fight.

Take again Mr. C. A. Sutherland, manager of the Amherst Shoe Company, who supplied some of the boots. What did he do? He supplied these boots to the department in accordance with the sample; but when 125 boys from the county of Cumberland enlisted and were going to the front, he said: "I have a better boot for active service"—and he goes to his directors, and his directors with him make a present of 125 pairs of boots that they have themselves made different from the boots they supplied to the Militia Department, and they say: "'That is the boot that is going to equip the Cumberland county boys." When he comes before the committee and we ask him whether he thinks the exhibit is a boot suitable for active service or whether the boot that his firm has given the soldiers from Cumberland is the best, he says: "Our own boot is the best beyond all question."

Take the evidence of Mr. Alfred Minister, who came into prominence in connection with this matter. He is a member of the firm of Minister, Myles & Co., Toronto, which in 1913 was placed upon the list of firms which could supply boots to the department. My hon. friend the minister knows Mr. Minister.

Major General HUGHES: I never heard of the gentleman in my lifetime until I heard his name in connection with this boot inquiry.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do you know Mr. Myles?

Major General HUGHES: I know him well, but I never knew Bobby Myles was in the shoe business.

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not know Bobby Myles, but I know a Major Myles who came before the committee.

Major General HUGHES: The same man.

Mr. MACDONALD: He looked like a military gentleman.

Major General HUGHES: I knew him very well, but I never knew he was in the shoe business.

Mr. MACDONALD: It was not through Bobby that you put Mr. Minister on the patronage list?

Major General HUGHES: I never heard of him before.

Mr. MACDONALD: The firm was placed on the list by my hon. friend.

Major General HUGHES: I do not know that my hon. friend has any data for his statement.

Mr. MACDONALD: He stated it was so.

Major General HUGHES: Who stated it?

Mr. MACDONALD: It appears in the evidence that the firm was placed on the patronage list on my hon. friend's recommendation since he came into office.

Major General HUGHES: It is all the same; I do not deny it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Minister, Myles & Company were friends of the Minister of Militia's party, and they were given the right to supply boots in consequence. The result is that as far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, it does not lie in their mouths to abuse Mr. Minister when he comes along and alleges that he has conscientious views in regard to the matter. On account of the fact that five or six gentlemen were endeavouring to examine Mr. Minister all at once, it was only natural that you would not have a connected story from him when he gave his statement first; but what appeared beyond all doubt was this, that having tendered in 1913 and not getting the contract, he was asked in August, 1914, to tender, and he referred the department to the old figure, and that finally after several telegrams had been exchanged, he came to Ottawa in

September, and when he went to the Militia Department and saw the sample of boot which he was asked to follow, he took the position which he swore he then took that he would not make such boots at any price at all.

I have some further evidence in regard to this matter. Mr. Minister has written to the Toronto World in detail since then giving the substance of his conversation with Lieutenant Colonel Brown, inspector of saddlery and boots, and he says:

I asked Col. Brown whether he thought that a suitable boot could be made for the price, $3.85, I think it was. He replied he did not think it could. I then picked up a boot and said to Col. Brown that I would not make such boots as these at any price, as I would hate to think that any man had suffered, or maybe lost his life, through wearing a pair of boots made by me; that these men were risking their lives for us, and should have the best shoes that could be made. I was disgusted and angry clear through at the indifference shown as to whether the men were properly shod, as I consider this one of the most important things in a soldier's outfit.

That is what Mr. Minister says, who comes from my hon. friend's camp; because it is no Liberal that is in the business at all. This gentleman struck me having seen him only on the occasion on which he gave his evidence, as being a man who was impressed most seriously with the responsibility which would fall upon one who was engaged in supplying equipment for men going out to fight. Having had some experience in observing witnesses and estimating the value of evidence, I think there could not be the slightest fault found with him on account of his demeanour. Then we have the gentleman whom my hon. friend himself appoints as chief advisor to the department, on the subject of boots. My hon. friend from North Oxford reminds me—

Major General HUGHES: Did the hon. gentleman say that I appointed Colonel Brown to the department?

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. minister must not be listening to his friends and then rising to interrupt me because of what they say. If he listens to me and wishes to ask a question, I will be glad to answer it. I was not speaking of the appointment of Colonel Brown, but was speaking of Mr. Wickett, whom the hon. gentleman did appoint. But my hon. friend from North Oxford reminds me of what Mr. Tetreault said. Mr. Tetreault is a contractor from Montreal, one of the men who had a big contract with the Government. He swore that he had told Colonel Brown at the time when these boots were being made that it was ridiculous to put boots like these on a soldier. And he is a political friend of the minister.

Major General HUGHES: Is he a judge?

Mr. MACDONALD: He is a maker of boots and is the man to whom my hon. friend committed the task of making 10,000 pairs of boots which our boys are now wearing. Then, take Mr. Wickett, my hon. friend made representations to Council by memorandum that he wanted somebody to look into this boot question, because it was worrying him. So Mr. Wickett was appointed chief advisor on boots. If there were any lingering doubt in anybody's mind as to whether this boot was good for active service or not, surely, Mr. Wickett's testimony on the point ought to be good enough. And I do not see—speaking with all deference to those associated with me in the committee; our relations were of the most pleasant character—I do not see how they can disregard the evidence of Mr. Wickett and permit themselves to make the equivocal finding they do make in regard to this boot. For they do not give a certificate to it; but they talk of the improvements possible. Mr. Wickett produces a boot which he had designed himself. He was asked this question:

Q. Be good enough to take that boot which is nearest your ideal, and take No. 12, and point out the difference between the two of them beginning at the upper first.—A. The upper in this No. 12—

That is the Government boot.

—is perhaps no more than 5-ounce stock and in this (Exhibit 86) it is 6-ounce stock. This No. 86 is stuffed with hard grease, it is more pliable stock, and hence more water-resisting, and while this calf (No. 12) is a very good piece of leather, if it had been stuffed with hard grease it would have been much more suitable for wear in winter or wet weather.

Q. What is the difference between them in the sole?—A. The gauge, I should not think the outer one is more than 9 gauge, that is 9 gauge, that is 9 gauge in Exhibit 12, and then I should think the other is about 7 and the insole is hardly as heavy as this or the Standard Screw. I would much prefer to have No. 86—

That is his own boot.

—which is 10 gauge with a 7 middle sole and an 8 insole.

Q. So that there is no short slip sole in your 86?—A. No, it goes straight through.

Q. And the 86 is the Standard Screw, the other is a Goodyear Welt?—A. It is not only a single, but a double Standard Screw.

By Mr. Chairman:

Q. And the 12 is what?—A. Goodyear Welt, with a few loose nails put in the shank, and of course the shank is narrow and it is not suitable for a man using a spade, to drive the spade in the ground.

That is the Government boot; that is the boot that hon. gentlemen argue about. And according to the chief advisor of the Government with regard to boots it is not fit for use by a soldier to drive a spade into the ground. Of what use would that boot be to our boys in the trenches?

10 p.m.

Q. You provide more room in the boot?—A. For the toes, and for the ball of the foot too, oh, yes, that is in No. 86.

Q. Do you regard 86 as the boot which approaches nearest to your ideal?—A. Yes.

Q. You regard it as the boot that will be fit for active service when you have finished your work on it?—A. Yes.

Q. Whereas you do not so regard No. 12?—A. Not for active service, not for winter weather such as they have had. Of course for ordinary wear that boot was all right, for our home service.

Q. For the permanent force?—A. Yes.

There you have a description of the boot as given by my hon. friend's own expert, upon whose authority he is basing his case in this matter. This boot which they gave to the soldiers is, as we say in our report, good enough for the permanent force but not for active service.

Major General HUGHES: Yes, but not in winter weather.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not fit for active service.

Major General HUGHES: In winter weather.

Mr. MACDONALD: I could take my hon. friend over other portions of Mr. Wickett's evidence in which he speaks of the department's boot as a "summer boot." That is the kind of boot the hon. minister gave our soldiers for active service a "summer boot."

Then, take the evidence of Mr. Silver, who is one of my hon. friend's own inspectors. He was a man of long experience, and about the only good inspector my hon. friend had. One particular thing in regard to this boot matter was the ridiculous nature of this inspection. Mr. Silver was the only man who knew anything about the business of inspecting. Pointing to the Canadian sample boot, he said:

Q. Yes. This is not a heavy marching boot. (Pointing to Canadian sample boot.)—A. No, that is only fit for barracks and general parade, and it has been useful for that purpose for a number of years.

Q. But what about a boot of that type (pointing to Canadian sealed pattern)?—A. It is not intended for active service.

Then, take the evidence of Mr. Vallentine, from Waterloo, who was in the same position as Mr. Adams. He came along and said: I do not want to manufacture the departmental boot; it is not a good boot for active service; I will submit a sample of my own. As regards the manufacturers what occurs? The manufacturers were all dissatisfied with those boots. They appointed a delegation to come here to Ottawa to represent to the Government that this was not a good service boot. And they did so, and they had an inquiry, as explained by my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy). I could go along this line and make full quotations; but let me briefly state that no manufacturer is on record as stating that this governmental boot was a good active service boot.

Further, what about these regimental board meetings all over the country? We mentioned in our report that there were seventy. Over seventy boards had met way back about the 1st of March. And they have been meeting all over the country since. One met in Ottawa on 1st of April. How were these Boards constituted? The colonel of a regiment designated three officers under his command to give their judgment upon the boots that were submitted to them and to make a report. That report was sent to the district officer commanding the division or district where the examination had been made, and was forwarded to Ottawa.

It has been suggested by some hon. gentlemen that these men, who at any moment might be transported from our Canadian soil into the fore front of the battle and who in a month from now might be losing their lives in France or Belgium, have been holding these regimental Boards for the purpose of getting new boots for their men, that they really did not mean anything and that the Boards had no significance. The hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Rainville) argued that and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. McCurdy), with some elaboration, attempted to leave the impression that these officers, who were working hard at the various regimental depots getting their men into shape, in holding these Boards were endeavouring to create a situation under which tney could get new boots whether their men were entitled to them or not. That is a discreditable statement to make against the officers of this expeditionary force.

That is the situation; you cannot wink that out of sight. Write all the reports you want on that question, juggle with words as you will, but from 75 to 100 Boards of officers in this country, between Calgary in the West and Halifax in the East, have been

considering this boot question since the middle of September last and every one of them has condemned the boots.

Who else has condemned them? General Lessard said they were not good for active service. The minister's own brother said that twenty-five per cent of the boots served to them at Kingston were not much better than moccasins in wet weather. Colonel Allan, of Toronto, who seemed to me and to all the other hon. gentlemen in the committee to be a man with all the qualifications of an officer, said he would not care to lead any men into active service equipped with boots like that. And so on down the line. Here is Major McKenzie, from St. John, one of the leaders of the Bar in the province of Now Brunswick, to whom it was suggested, as I remember, by some hon. gentleman, when he was giving his evidence, that although he had held this Board under the direction of Colonel McAvity whose orders he had to obey, the Board was held for the sake of getting new boots for his men. Then we have the findings of the following officers: Major McKenzie, St. John; Colonel Seeley, Fredericton; Captain Taunton, Winnipeg; Captain Meredith, Ottawa; Colonel Hallick, Ottawa; Colonel Leonard, London; Major Inkstetter, Ottawa; Captain Howell, Montreal, and Major Andrews, Winnipeg. Out in Winnipeg they condemned 700 boots all at once; they said the whole outfit of boots they had were not fit to wear. I shall not trouble the House by reading in detail the report of the Board or the examination they made, but that was their declaration. I could go further through this list, but it is not necessary.

Then we come to what they did on the other side. Here is the unequivocal report of Colonel Howell of the first battalion at Salisbury; Colonel Labatt of the 41st battalion; Captain Warrington of the 14th, Major Fell of the first company of engineers and Major Lepsett of the second infantry brigade. All these men give their different statements in connection with the reports which they returned to headquarters and which were sent back here, to the effect that these boots are not a proper active service boot. When you add to that testimony the representations of General Alderson, unequivocal and positive, about which there can be no doubt, carrying out the findings made by the boards under him, together with the representations made by Sir George Perley to the Prime Minister, I think it is perfectly absurd for hon. gentlemen seriously to argue to this or any other body in this country that this boot issued by the Militia Department was a proper active service boot. That being so I think we can fairly conclude that the first statement contained in the report of the minority to this House is an absolutely correct one:

> That the boot supplied to the Canadian Permanent Force previous to the war, being similar to the boot sealed by the officials of the Militia Department on January 15, 1911, was a boot suitable only for men in barracks and in times of peace, and not for men on active service;

I submit that with the cloud of witnesses, professional and military, whom I have quoted to you, we have absolute proof of that statement in our report. Then we go on and make a specific statement to the effect that the sealed pattern boot in the department was too light for active service. What was done was this: When the contracts came to be called for what do you suppose they did in the Militia Department? Did they say to Ames, Holden & McCready, did they say to Gauthier, and these other people: "Here are specifications for a boot that you must follow exactly and closely, the circumstances demanding the utmost care"? Not at all. They gave no specifications to anybody, they simply went to the place in the department where Gauthier's boots were, which he delivered under the contract for the permanent force, they took out a boot and they put the seal of the department on it and said to Ames-Holden & Company, go out and make 10,000 pairs like that. When that boot came before the committee we asked Mr. Tetreault, who, as the member for North Oxford points out, had the instruments there for measuring, to tell us the weight of the leather and to make all other comparisons that could be made between the two boots, and Mr. Tetreault reported and swore to the committee the difference between these two boots, being as stated in the second paragraph of our report. He swore to that positively and unequivocally. He swore too that it was on a sample entirely inferior to the sealed pattern of 1911 that Ames-Holden & McCready made their boots. There is no question about that. No hon. gentleman could in any way shake the truth of that statement; it is a finding as absolutely uncontrovertible in any way as any finding of the fact by a judge could be made upon evidence where there was nothing to the contrary. Do you think that was good business? Do you think that that

was proper care displayed in regard to providing footwear for soldiers? No specifications, a poorer boot than the one sealed by the department, poorer leather, lighter weight leather, lighter slugs and an inferior boot as shown in the report.

How were the boots turned into Valcartier? There was an inspector in the factories of Ames-Holden and Gauthier, but there was no inspection for 13,000 delivered at Valcartier; and some of the inspectors who were at the factories in Montreal did not stay there all the time. The inspection of boots returned to headquarters at Ottawa was of no value, because all they could see was what was on the outside. The place for inspection was in the factory, where they could see the leather that went into the boots, see how it was cut, see whether they put in the thin parts or only those parts of the hide that ought to go in. The inspection in that respect, as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have preceded me have pointed out, was deficient in every respect, deficient in regard to the extent of it, and deficient in regard to the competency of the inspector. Why, one of the inspectors was a young man who got a letter from a member of Parliament asking Mr. Burns in the Department to see whether he could give this young fellow any work. He had no special qualifications for an inspector, and was employed for a time sorting boots; and in a week or so he was transformed into an inspector, upon whose judgment rests the determination whether or not the boots are good enough to go to the front. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the proper way to deal with a matter of this kind.

Further, what were the boots out of which these sample boots were taken? These sample boots were taken from the boots supplied by Gauthier, under a contract they had made the previous spring through Slater. Gauthier was getting $3.72 a pair for these boots, but it was sworn to before the Committee that they were made at $3.02. The result was that the country was getting a boot which cost only $3.02 to make, instead of a boot that cost $3.50 or $3.60, allowing for a reasonable profit for the manufacturer; the balance went to Mr. Slater. It was out of these deficient boots, made under those conditions, that these samples, inferior to the sealed sample, were selected and handed out to the contractor on which to contract. Is it any wonder that there were complaints when the boots began to come in? Is it any wonder that there was trouble in all parts of the country in regard to them? Is it any wonder that at the end of September every corps that was employed in Halifax on active service had a regimental board examining into these Gauthier's boots which had been part of the permanent contract for the year? It was sworn to by reputable men that soldiers were walking around with shingles and bags on their feet because their boots had absolutely worn out and they could not get any more. The Minister had that evidence before him; if not before him personally, it was in his department. On the first of October, without making any change whatever in the specifications except providing for a double sole, he still allowed these boots to be made by some manufacturers, according to the inferior samples, according to a sample which they had purchased, and which had not been carefully examined by any one before being sent out as a sample. Then we had a period in which, as we all know from one end of Canada to the other every man who was on active service, whether as a private, non-commissioned officer, or officer, raised the issue in regard to these boots being inefficient. And what did my hon. friend do? He did nothing until he appointed Lt.-Col. Hallick's Board of Inquiry, a purely departmental proposition. Lt.-Col. Hallick came back and told him on the 7th of January: Your boot is absolutely unsuitable for active service. Everybody had said that the boot was unsatisfactory and unsuitable for active service. That was the situation on the 7th of January. In the meantime representations were made from Salisbury Plain as to the boots being unsatisfactory, and the absurd suggestion was made of sending overshoes for the men to wear over their boots. But General Alderson was not going to fool with the question. He at once went off and bought English boots. My hon. friend the General says that if he had been here he would have stopped him from doing it. But General Alderson solved the problem: he went off and bought English boots.

Major General HUGHES: Has the hon. gentleman any report as to the wearing of English boots by the soldiers?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend is an adept at the art of steering the discussion into other channels. I venture to predict that when he speaks he will tell us about the English boot, the French boot, the

German boot, the Italian boot, the American boot, every boot in the world except this bad Canadian boot.

Major General HUGHES: Is the Canadian soldier wearing the English boot today? No, he is not.

Mr. MACDONALD: The only report I have in regard to the English boot is the statement of General Alderson that he had put English boots on the Canadian soldiers, in place of my hon. friend's bad boots.

Major General HUGHES: Did they keep them on?

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not know. As I have said to my hon. friend, I am speaking entirely from the evidence that is before us, and I am not going outside of it. I do not know what reports my hon. friend may have.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What about the quotation from the Toronto World?

Mr. MACDONALD: Does my hon. friend regard that as being a very serious departure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nothing that the hon. gentleman has said is very serious.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is very clever, my hon. friend is excelling himself. I am reminded by my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) that I directed Col. Brown's attention to the statement that was in the Toronto papers, so my reference to it was entirely relevant, so far as keeping to the evidence is concerned. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia will discuss in the most delightful way, with all that eloquence and in that jaunty way which so thoroughly characterizes him, the merits and defects of every other boot in the world, but you will not get him down to the kind of boot he supplied the Canadian boys who went out to fight. He will not come up to the breastworks and discuss that question. For once in his life he will run away. The situation, then, was this: General Alderson was protesting, Sir George Perley was cabling, and the regimental boards were sending in their complaints; but my hon. friend the minister kept right along handing out to every battalion that was mobilized in Canada these boots that were manufactured according to the defective sample of the department. When we asked the minister in the committee why he was doing this, he said: We are not going to let this Canadian money that we have put into these boots be thrown away; let these fellows take the boots. I venture to suggest that the Canadian people would stand behind him in giving our soldiers the best possible boot at the earliest possible moment, without regard to the question of money. But the minister thought it better to use the bad boots.

Major General HUGHES: My hon. friend is wrong in stating that I thought it better to use the bad boots. I thought it was better that they should use these good boots.

Mr. MACDONALD: Good boots, with the exception of the heels and the toes and the vamps—three very important exceptions. My hon. friend was going to give these boots to the soldiers in spite of all the defects which he admits the existence of. He insisted upon putting these boots on the Canadian soldier with all their defects.

Major General HUGHES: These are not defects. Possibly there might be improvements.

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not know how my hon. friend reasons.

Major General HUGHES: Anything above the average standard I would consider an improvement, not a defect.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend thinks they are so good, but yet he wants to improve them. We had one very loquacious witness before the committee, who said that he called a certain kind of boot the Excelsior. I do not know whether the minister regards this boot as of the Excelsior type. I do not think he put it on that high pedestal. The fact remains that he still went on giving out these boots, although every one was complaining. The question is whether or not the minister should not have acted sooner. He had ample notice in September, but he never did anything until he appointed Lt.Col. Hallick's board. Why did he not send for Mr. Wickett?

Mr. Wickett swore that if he had been there last summer he could have prescribed a boot which could have been used long before this. My hon. friend did nothing until the 10th February, when he sent a memorandum to Council. The accumulated evidence is absolutely indisputable that the boot in the department that Mr. Wickett calls a summer boot, a boot for the use of the permanent force in Canada, was not a boot for active service, that it was totally unfit for active service and that being so, the Government were to blame in that they supplied a boot which was inferior even to

the boot, according to the evidence of Mr. Tetreault, which they might have supplied. Since September last they have never made a move to get a proper boot. At this moment there are requisitions for 20,000 pairs of boots from all over Canada, and they have not a boot in store to give them. In addition to imposing a boot upon the men which is not a proper boot, they have fooled with this question until at this moment, if there was a sudden demand for our men to leave our shores on account of some contingency on the other side, my hon. friend has no boots to give them and has no definite specification or design or field pattern yet in the department upon which to have them constructed. Of these facts there can be no question whatever.

A great deal has been said in regard to the question of the responsibility of the manufacturers. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) takes a very generous view in regard to the manufacturers. The situation is that a certain number of manufacturers came before us and made out a prima facie case in support of the view that they had made the boots according to sample. But mark you, the investigation upon that point did not go to the length to which it ought to have gone if we were to determine the matter beyond any question or if we were to be enabled to arrive at a proper judgment upon it. We had no experts who had made any close examination with the exception of Messrs. Hoar and Coté, whose examination was confined purely to the boots that were rejected. It must be remembered that quite a number of manufacturers who were notified to come did not come at all. Consequently we have no evidence showing, in regard to the products of the different manufacturers what number of boots were defective as compared with the sample or their own samples. That is the situation in regard to the matter.

We know that these boots were unquestionably of no value whatever on active service, and that they were condemned by these regimental boards. The Government are responsible for these boots primarily irrespective of whether the manufacturers make good the defects in construction or not. My hon. friend the Major General assumes responsibility for these matters when he says that he looked into this question and it is well that we should note what he says upon that point. My hon. friend heard at St. John, at Quebec, at Kingston, and also while he was out West, that these boots were not satisfactory but in speaking about the question as to who was responsible for the issue of these boots he made the following statement at page 1022 of the evidence.

By Mr. Nesbitt:

Q. Do you think the men should have been served with a lighter boot, and with that boot rather than a heavier boot?—A. Those were boots that were in stock. There was a hurry; the British and French were retreating from Mons to the Marne. Those were the boots that had given satisfaction; our regular soldiers had reported favourably on them for years and years; it was on this basis that my predecessor, Sir Frederick Borden, had booted the soldiers. I had consulted officers, and after seeing the unanimity in regard to the boot, with the exception that I thought the boot should be wider at the toe, I suggested that we should use that, but the soldiers said they had no trouble with corns on their feet on account of their being narrow, the only thing was if they had a larger size and nice soft leather they should continue the boot on the recommendation of the officers of the department and no change was made, and so far as the wear of the boots is concerned, excepting the heavy marching around the frozen grounds of Canada, and putting their feet up on stoves to dry them, as soldiers do, and walking around knee deep in mud at Salisbury Plain, I never had any difficulty.

That is a summary of the minister's position, that is the evidence that I have submitted and it cannot be questioned. It shows that the position of the minister is absolutely indefensible. My hon. friend knows that it is not an active service boot. My hon. friend knows that it was not an active service boot. My hon. friend knows that these boots ought to have been changed long ago. From the 1st October last my hon. friend and the Government have been guilty of gross negligence in permitting this boot to be used by a single soldier whether in Canada or abroad.

I would like to note the situation in regard of my hon. friends in a very few words. It will be noticed that my hon. friends divide thei rreport into certain branches, according to the subject matter, dealing first with the Hallick board of inquiry. My hon. friends say that the board was of no consequence. It was constituted, I assume, under military regulations. It was ineffective in so far as any results were concerned and in so far as the failure to swear the witnesses that appeared before them was concerned. Personally the weight I attached to it was the opinion of Col. Hallick and his associates on the point as to whether this boot was a boot suitable for active service; so far and no farther, and I think that is the view of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

That is the only importance we attach to hat report; but these gentlemen having worn what their opinion was as to the fficiency of the boot, that sworn testimony ad to be taken into consideration. As egards the sample boot my hon. friends pposite do not discuss the difference beween the field pattern and the sample. hey do not mention the fact that the deartment failed to give a specification to he contractors when they awarded the ontract. My hon. friends discussed the alue of this boot as a military boot from nly one standpoint. They produced and uote evidence as to the conditions of alisbury Plain and they show that they ere very wet. They argue that because onditions at Salisbury Plain were very ad and that no boots culd stand them, herefore they say the reports in regard the Canadian boots are not so bad beause no boot could stand the conditions ere. Relying entirely on the Salisbury lain test they say that you could not y a word against the Canadian boot. hey absolutely fail to take into consideration the uniform character of the reorts in Canada in regard to these boots om all quarters and the evidence of Mr. oar and Mr. Wickett and of those manucturers whom I have already quoted.

Then my hon. friends take the position regard to the very crux of the whole uestion, not that this boot, which was a mple boot in the department, was a od boot for active service or for all purses, but that with some improvements e sample might be made a very good ot. That is the very best my hon. friends n say—that with some improvements the mple boot might be made a very good ot. That is not the kind of boot that e Canadian people want their soldiers wear, a boot that with some improvents which are going to be made in the m and misty future but which have never en undertaken up to this moment might a good boot. That, I say, is not the nd of boot that the Canadian people want give their boys to wear when they away to fight. They want to give them e best boot they can get and they want to provide for it.

My hon. friends say that the failure to spect these boots was due to the rush. hat was to prevent the Department of litia and Defence from going into every ntre of the country where boots were ng manufactured and employing attendce upon the factory in order to see that boots were properly made?

Mr. Macdonald.]

There was gross neglect in not supplying inspectors in every portion of the country, for had we had such inspection we could know where these manufacturers all are in regard to this matter.

We are told by honourable gentlemen opposite about the exceptional weather conditions on Salisbury Plain, and that in fairly dry weather the boots gave fair satisfaction. But last week we had before us two sturdy young Canadians, officers in the field battery which mobilized in Ottawa on the 1st of March, and these two fine young men told us with an earnestness that was most convincing that right here on Cartier Square in the city of Ottawa, in this beautiful springtime, nine of these boots they produced as sample, boots with a double sole, had gone to pieces in three weeks, under ordinary usage. There was a fair weather test of these boots which ought to settle that question if ever there was a question about it.

I submit, Sir, that every one of the allegations in the report made by the minority of the committee is supported by the evidence. Those of the committee who sit on this side of the House went through every line of that thousand pages of evidence with the greatest possible care, and I pledge my word as a professional man, with whatever legal knowledge I have, that hon. gentlemen opposite will search the evidence from one end to the other without being able to say that the findings we have placed there consecutively are not borne out by the evidence. And that being so, if the result of this inquiry shows conclusively that the men who compose the Overseas Expeditionary Force not only those who have gone abroad but those who are preparing to go have been fitted out with a boot which is not an active service boot in any respect whatever, and which fails to give that comfort and ease which every soldier has a right to look to, then the blame should be placed on the proper shoulders, and the proper shoulders for that blame to lie on are the shoulders of the men who are responsible for seeing that a proper boot was given to our Canadian soldiers. I assert, Mr. Speaker, that the report of the minority of that committee cannot be controverted; that it is absolutely supported by the evidence given, and that the longer the question is studied the more will it be endorsed by the people of Canada.

Sir JAMES AIKINS (Brandon): The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy)

pening his address stated that he was pinion that one of the most important gs a soldier should have is a good , and that in that opinion the Duke Vellington had concurred. I shall not tion such authority.

. MURPHY: I am glad the hon. leman agrees in that view, but I did put the names quite in the order he mentioned.

JAMES AIKINS: The hon. member Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) made the same rvation, and it caused me to wonder long these hon. gentlemen, and those whom they are politically associated, entertained that opinion, because for y years we have been equipping our ia force with proper clothing, and er arms and equipment, but, on the ority of the hon. member for Pictou, question of service boots for the sol- was never considered when the Gov- ent which he supported was in power. ave had a permanent force varying in gth for many years, and notwithstand- hat these gentlemen opposite think the the most important part of the sol- ' equipment, never have they consid- the propriety of selecting a military They tell us that the specifications 00, 1905 and 1911 were never intended n active service boot; then what did iberal Government intend the boot for? it for a dancing pump, as suggested by on. member for Pictou, or a larrigan out hunting in, or a brogan in which mp the mountains? If the specifica- for boots prepared by the Liberal rnment were not intended for a sol- boot, for use under all circumstances, was the purpose? It would do more to the sanity of the late Liberal Gov- ent, it would be a greater compliment e common sense of hon. gentlemen it opposite if they admitted at once that specifications had been prepared and sample boot was made and adopted e purpose of a Canadian military boot. they waiting to design a miltary boot the war crisis was upon them? Were vaiting for an emergency, as usual? The ience of many countries has taught it takes not months but many years oduce a suitable military boot, and yet gentlemen opposite now claim that they were in power they never under- o deal with the question. Is that con- ble? They are responsible for the ication and sealed pattern boot upon which those supplied to the troops were made.

When the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) broke upon the committee one morning with fulminating impetuosity such as you have seen him display just now, he made the statement that the function of the committee was inquisitorial as well as judicial. He regards and properly regards, the duty of an Opposition is to watch and to criticise the action of the Administration; but the policy of an Opposition should not be solely a destructive policy. It should be constructive as well, and under present circumstances it is the duty of an Opposition to assist an Administration to arrive at the best conclusion as to what boots should be provided; if they think the one in use is faulty. That the Opposition in this House has not done. We who are supporting this Administration feel it as much our duty also to watch the Administration, to see that it is efficient, to see that no fraudulent schemes involve it, and to see that it stands before the people of Canada as deserving of their support.

This is no time for people to make money out of the miseries and wretchedness of war. Any man, who for the purposes of improper gain stands on one side of the public chest and, unwatched will put his hand in for some money to put into his pocket when there are tens of thousands of our good loyal citizens, rich and poor, young and old, constantly trying, out of their savings and their sacrifices to put something into that public treasury or to assist in carrying on the war, is a man who is not only an unworthy citizen, but absolutely disloyal and merits not only the condemnation but the swift punishment to which he is properly entitled. This is no time for palliation; the old principle should prevail:

> On those who fall, severity; but towards those, goodness, if they continue in that goodness; otherwise let them be cut off.

It was in that spirit that the members of the committee from this side of the House joined the members of the committee from the other side of the House in making a thorough investigation. Those inquisitorial functions have, I believe, been properly performed; but the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) also stated that the functions of the committee were judicial. Whether the members of this side of the House in preparing the majority report acted judicially or not will be deter-

mined by a reading of that report. Whether the members from the Opposition were judicial in their report must also be determined by the report itself. It is not judicial to be partisan or prejudiced, it is not judicial to make findings of facts inconsistent with the evidence. If prejudice and partisanship and improper findings are judicial, then the minority report is highly judicial.

This statement is made in the minority report, that it was in 1905 that boots of a similar pattern to the 1914 boot were first adopted by the department for use in time of peace by the permanent force of Canada. This is contradicted in the evidence of Mr. McCann, at page 1029, as follows:

Q. When was there a definite written specification? Was there one prior to 1900?—A. I think there was but it was a very crude affair.

Q. Could you find that specification for us?—A. It is down in the department, I think.

Q. I may be wrong, but I understood in looking over the files, that 1900 was the first time a specification was really prepared in the department?—A. really practical specification.

Then sample boot marked exhibit 77 was produced, and the question was asked:

This is the sample boot that gave difficulty in 1899?

Mark the date.

A. Well, it led to this specification.

That is an entirely different specification.

By Mr. Macdonald.

Q. Have you got a pattern of that 1900 South African boot? Have you not got a sample boot?—A. I do not think there is one in existence.

Q. In 1900 there was a specification laid down for the South African war, but you have not got the 1900 boot.—A. I don't think so.

Q. Was there not one in the department?—A. There was at the time.

So that in 1900 there was a sample boot produced entirely different from the boot made in 1899. The evidence of General Macdonald at page 211 is as follows:

Q. You had a sample boot in your department from which you had boots manufactured?—A. Yes. After I became Quartermaster General I found that sample boot in the department.

Q. Then in 1904 when you became Quartermaster General, you found in the department a sample boot?—A. Yes.

Q. Which had been used for how many years?—A. Well, perhaps for three years.

Q. Then your recollection is that from 1904 down to the present time the boot that was issued by department gave general satisfaction?—A. General satisfaction.

Q. You say it looks like the boot?—A. It looks like the boot, yes.

Q. What experience did the department have with this boot?—A. Well, the boot, of course, up to the commencement of the war was worn only by the permanent force. Or, do you mean what sort of wear?

Q. Yes. What satisfaction did the boot give to the permanent force?—A. Well, the permanent force have their training at Petawawa, perhaps for two or three months every summer, and their boots are subjected to the ordinary wear and team of drilling, marching out and so on. That is as far as I can speak.

Then Lt. Col. Macdonald, when he was being examined, said:

Q. You served in the South African war, did you?—A. Yes.

Q. And the boot that was used at that time was what they called a Slater boot?—A. Yes.—well we in the Strathcona Horse used a boot that gave good wear.

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. They were purchased by Lord Strathcona?—A. Yes, but it was a Slater boot, and I believe that the departmental boot was also a Slater boot, as far as I can recall now.

Q. And they were similar to that model boot?—A. As far as I know.

Q. And they gave good service?—A. There were no complaints about them.

Q. How long have you been connected with the Militia Department?—A. Since 1903.

Q. And this is the boot that has been used ever since that time?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you made no change?—A. No.

You will see from this evidence that there was a specification for a military boot prior to 1905, and that the sample of it was in the department. So that the statement made in this minority report is inaccurate, that it was in 1905 that the boots of similar pattern to the pattern of 1914 were first adopted. My hon. friends took that position because they want to get away from the fact that that boot, Exhibit 5, their pattern boot, or a boot similar to it, was used in the South African war, and that it gave general satisfaction there as an active service boot, and thus justified the present Canadian army boot, Mr. H. W. Brown, director of contracts, says in respect of this, at page 110.

Q. I want to go back again now, for a moment, to clean up this specification question? As I understand it the pattern you have was adopted in 1903 and 1904 and it remained substantially the same until 1910 or 1911?—A. Yes.

Q. This is the sealed pattern. . . . which is marked Exhibit 5? Now this is the sealed sample that was adopted in 1911. Is that the sample of boot that has been followed from that time to the present time?—A. Yes, with this exception. This feature here (indicating) was cut out. That is the slashing or ratting on the sole, which was cut out almost immediately after.

Q. That is Exhibit 5?—A. Yes, Mr. Slater sent us that specification.

Q. Which of the Slaters?—A. Charles E. Slater of the Slater Shoe Co.

The man who made the big commission, it is said, out of the Gauthier boot.

They were the departmental contractors and sent us up a specification to supply this. His people made it. That specification provided for the supply of dressing.

To make their point and reflect on this Government it then became necessary to displace the fact that they are responsible for the sample boot on which the boots for the present war were manufactured. How do they seek to do this? It is very ingenious. I had better read exactly what they say in the minority report:

That the boots given to the contractors in August last by the Department of Militia and Defence, as sample boots, in accordance with which they were to manufacture the boots under their contracts, were inferior to the sealed department boot in the following respects.

If they can prove that they were inferior, then to that extent they relieve themselves of the responsibility for the class of boot made for our soldiers. Let us see in what way they say they were inferior. Remember, that the statement was made that all the samples given to the manufacturers, or used by the manufacturers and approved by the Government, in the making of the soldiers boots and therefore all the boots manufactured were inferior to that (Exhibit 5) sealed pattern adopted by the late Government. They say that a comparison was made by Mr. Tetreault between Exhibit 5, the sealed pattern, and Exhibit 12, the sample boot given to one manufacturer. I quote from Mr. Tetreault's evidence.

Q. Would you look at these two boots (Exhibit 12 and Exhibit 5) and tell us the difference between them? The one is the sealed sample and the other is the sealed pattern?—A. This one, Exhibit 5 is much firmer and heavier leather than the other, Exhibit 12; that is, the upper leather.

Q. What is the difference between the weight of the two?—A. No. 5 is two and four-tenths.

Q. That is the sealed pattern—A. Yes, in the upper; and the other Exhibit 12, is one point six.

This upper leather or quarter is the part of the boot that goes around the ankle. I would suggest that any hon. member who is wearing ankle boots should look at his boots and see whether this upper, or quarter or back, as it is called, is as heavy as the other portions of the leather in the boot, and also to consider if he would like to have heavy leather around the ankle which might prevent the free movement of the ankle. Does the fact that it is finer leather render it inferior to the other? Let us see what is stated by Colonel Brown at page 182. Lighter leather is approved:

Q. Did I understand rightly from the evidence that for the smaller size of boots light stock was used? that is, lighter leather?—A. Only in the quarters, that is according to the specification.

Q. In these smaller size boots, lighter leather was used?—A. Principally in the smaller sizes, I think especially in the smaller sizes.

Now, Exhibit 12, it happened, was about the smallest boot produced—it was a six and a half. If we look at the specification, dealing with "facing," we find that special provision is made that the quarter or upper may be thinner:

None except where stock is light in weight (usually in the small sizes) and necessitates a facing to hold eyelets properly.

In other words, you could get the quarter so light that it would not hold an eyelet, and a facing is put on to protect the boot and hold the eyelet. Therefore, the statement they make that the sample boot, Exhibit 12, was inferior to the sealed sample, Exhibit 5, by reason of the upper being a little lighter is contradicted by the specification. It is not inferior. Then, Mr. Tetreault speaks of the vamps:

Q. What about the vamps?—A. Just about the same proportion. It might be a little less difference than in the upper. This vamp I consider has less difference in the weight than there is in the upper.

That is the uncontradicted evidence, and the only evidence. Yet, what is the finding in the report of the minority concerning it, based on this evidence?

In vamps there was the same proportinate difference between the two as to weight and thickness.

A statement at variance with the evidence and false. And we are asked to endorse that untruth and to accept that finding.

The minority report says that "in the sample zinc slugs were used and in the pattern steel slugs were used." That is clearly contradicted by Mr. Stephens, one who sat on that Court of Inquiry presided over by Colonel Hallick:

Q. Would you look at this boot (Exhibit 5) which is apparently a sealed sample and tell me if that was one of the boots you saw?—A. It was a similar boot we saw; I cannot say if it was the actual boot.

Q. Is that boot constructed with steel slugs?—A. No, sir.

Q. What slugs are they?—A. Well, I am not an expert on slugs but they are not steel, I know.

The matter of slugs is comparatively immaterial. The sole is one of the most material parts of the boot. Mr. Tetreault had said referring to the sole:

Q. What about the sole?—A. This sole, Exhibit 12, is about 9½, I measured it a while ago. This sole (referring to Exhibit 5) is s

full 10. This (referring to Exhibit 12) is not a full 10; it is near enough.

Mr. Hoar, the inspector (page 1221), who cut open the boot (Exhibit 12), proved conclusively that the outer sole of exhibit 12 was 11 gauge, and the slip was 7 gauge, whereas only 6 gauge was required by the specification.

Again, Tetreault says:

A. In Exhibit 12 it is a larger thread than in Exhibit 5. If each one had a larger thread it would be better.

So we find the sample Exhibit 12, given at least to one manufacturer, has a better sole han sample No. 5, better sewing, a vamp that is just as good as in No. 5, an upper that is according to specifications; and yet in their report which they have sent out to the world, they say that exhibit 12 was inferior to exhibit No. 5. Statements not supported by the evidence.

But there is something else to which I would call your attention which is equally amazing and that is, as I have pointed out, that they say that these inferior samples were the samples upon which the contractors manufactured boots supplied to the Government, because sample exhibit 12 was followed. Bear in mind this, that there were exhibits No. 55 and No. 57, samples given to manufacturers which were not compared at all with sample No. 5, and were not inferior to it. I quote from the evidence of Mr. C. S. Sutherland, of the Amherst Boot and Shoe Company:

Q. How did you manufacture, by sample?—A. By sample and specification.
Q. By both?—A. Yes.

And their statement was that none of these were manufactured according to specifications.

Q. Who prepared your sample?—A. It is a Gauthier boot, I have the sample here.
Q. Oh yes, you have the original sample (sample boot produced by witness) this is the same sample that was given your company to manufacture from?—A. Yes.
Mr. Pringle: We will mark this as Exhibit 55.

Which was never compared with exhibit 5. The Amherst Boot and Shoe Company manufactured according to sample 55, and yet a statement goes out in the minority report that this sample on which this manufacturer made his boot was inferior to sample No. 5.

The same as to Tetreault, one of the largest manufacturers, who did not manufacture according to sample 12, but according to exhibit 57.

Q. How were the boots to be made?—A. Made the same as the sealed pattern here.

[Sir James Aikins.]

Q. Is that the sealed pattern?—A. That one that was left with me; yes, I had tw them.
Now we have another sealed pattern w will be exhibit No. 57.

This was exhibit No. 57.

Q. Then your contract was to manufact a boot similar to Exhibit 57?—A. Yes.
Q. In that sample, as I understand it, vamps and uppers are of winter calf?—A. winter calf.
Q. And the sole is of what?—A. Oak.
Q. Were the boots manufactured by you accordance with the sample?—A. Exactly,

Tetrault is another manufacturer w manufactured according to another sam and not according to exhibit No. 12. T minority report says that his boots w manufactured on an inferior samp which is not substantiated. None of manufacturers manufactured according sample 12 except one, the Ames Hold Company, and yet the statement of t minority goes out to the world that all t boots that were manufactured, some 18 000 pairs, according to what they allege an inferior sample, exhibit 12; where the fact is that the Ames-Holden compar who had exhibit 12, manufactured or something like 30,500, and according to specification made by that firm fully up the specification of the department. I a the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsle and all others if they append their si nature to that minority report and decla to the people that it should be support and carried in this Parliament when su untrue, misleading statements are ma in connection with it.

The minority report seeks to hold t Government responsible in negligence, firs because the sample on which the boots we manufactured was inferior to the seal pattern adopted by the Administratio this was not true as shown, als because there was not a proper inspe tion. The inspectors were men who we well qualified. Prenter, who examined t boots of the Ames, Holden Company alon with Robert Wilson, was in the departmer for six years. He was especially instructe to inspect by Colonel Brown, who cut ope the boots and explained the whole manu facture and construction of the boots t him on several occasions. Robert Wilso had six or seven years experience as a boo manufacturer, and understood the makin of the boots. Mr. A. E. Baldwin had eigh years' experience working in leather fac tories, and he inspected at Tetreault's wit Silver, and he says all the boots were equa to the samples, and steel slugs were used i

the Tetreault factory. Silver, about whose experience there is no dispute, was inspector with Baldwin. Jacques was a shoemaker with a large business, and he had been such for over 38 years. He examined at Gauthier's and said that the Gauthier boot was made with steel slugs and that Exhibit 12 was a good military boot.

It is complained that there was no inspection of boots at Valcartier. Well, why? Because the evidence says the exigencies were such that they could not possibly inspect them. No sooner did the boots arrive in the cars than they were put into the warehouse and from the other side of the warehouse delivered to men clamouring for boots, some of whom were said to be almost barefooted, others with practically no boots. Was there any failure by reason of that? I am not a special friend of the manufacturers. They are a strongly protected class and able to look out for themselves. Yet shall we say that because the manufacturers are a protected class, and have made money, that they are not as loyal, not as patriotic as other citizens of our country? Can we suppose for one moment that they would commit a fraud upon the country by depriving the soldiers of the opportunity of having a good boot? The evidence is exactly the contrary. Such were the firms as the John McPherson Company, of which Mr. Duffield is manager, the Ames, Holden Company, the Tetreault Company, and many others who showed that they made a better boot for the Government than the sealed sample. They could not afford to do other than what was right. Assuming that they thought some of their boots might escape inspection, could they imagine that those boots which were sent to Valcartier where the soldiers were would escape that inspection? Would they run the risk of that? The thing, on its face, is absurd. The evidence showed that the inspection was good, more thorough than the ordinary inspection, because the inspectors whom I have mentioned were placed in the factories to see the boot as it was being manufactured, that the leather was good, that the construction was good, and that the boot turned out was according to the sample.

But there is another thing which was very important, and that is the third charge of negligence that is made against the Government that the boot supplied to the Canadian Permanent Force previous to the war, and to the troops since, being a boot similar to the boot sealed by the officials in the Militia Department in January, 1911, was suitable only for men in barracks and in times of peace, and not for active service. Does the minority report or do the men who made that report say in what respect they were not suitable for active service? They base their statement that the boots were not suitable for active service upon the evidence said to have been given by certain witnesses, Mr. Tetreault among others, but only partially quoted. Let us see what Mr. Tetreault says (page 780):

A. I got 1,800 lasts of the celebrated 1.35. I never used them. I told Colonel Brown that I was not going to risk making shoes with that last which would not fit anybody. It was the "E" last.

You will notice that Mr. Tetreault says that it was the "E" last that was unsuitable. He goes on:

We got the model and made shoes, and found the "F" last more suitable, as the "E" last did not have the measurement.

Then, on page 781:

Q. You have mentioned something about "F" lasts. I notice that in the specifications which are printed on page 16 of Appendix 1, there is reference made to widths "E" and "F". Does that refer to the last?—A. That is the last "E" and "F". The "E" last we got made was never used.

Q. Then "F" would be all right?—A. Yes, it was a pointed toe last though, a little too pointed for active service.

So Mr. Tetreault found it unsuitable, because the "E" last wast too narrow; but the Government specifications provided for an "F" last. He said that the boot was unsuitable only because the toe was too narrow. I turn to the evidence given by Mr. Adams, to whom the last speaker has referred:

Exhibit 57—A seal sample boot—Gauthier make —Tan winter calf and oak sole.

Q. In the second order of boots that you made, did you make them after your own sample?—A. No, they were made after the same sample with the exception that instead of a single sole and slit they were made double sole.

Q. That is the department in October decided to have a double sole on all of them?—A. I believe so.

Q. And in consequence you were instructed to put a double sole on yours; in other respects, however, the boot was made in accordance with your own sample and not in accordance with the sample?—A. Exactly the same.

Q. I know that, but why did you submit them?—A. Because I considered the double sole was a necessity for the soldiers.

Q. That is you did not think the boot the department had was suitable for the soldiers —A. Exactly.

Q. You have seen boots of the style of Exhibit 12, that has been so much talked about here?—A. Yes.

Q. You did not consider they were suitable for active service, and you submitted the boot that you thought would be suitable; is that it? —A. That is it.

Q. In what respect?—A. Well No. 12 is a slipsole, and I do not think it is a good quality of boot.

This was changed by the department, and Mr. Adams manufactured a boot containing a double sole, and which he declared to be good for active service.

Then, the minority report makes a statement about Mr. Silver:

That Mr. William Silver, one of the inspectors employed by the department stated that the boot was not intended for active service, and that, "we all acknowledge the boots were too light for the use they were put to;"

But they did not state something else that Mr. Silver said, which is found on page 303:

Q. Do you mean the boots they are wearing on Salisbury Plain? A. No, at Valcartier. Had they put on those heavy British boots, or boots as heavy, as those, they would have been cripples instead of soldiers.

Q. Well, they do not seem to have had many of these cripples you speak of among the English soldiers? A. Well, they are used to that kind of boot. Those men have always been wearing those heavy boots. Englishmen have always had heavy boots; our Canadian men don't have them.

Q. Your theory is that if we have them heavy marching boots, such as the British service demands, they would find them.—A. Too hard. . . . These boots (pointing to the Canadian boots) have answered their purpose. We have got the men broken in. When they go over to the Old Country and get into active service they are ready for the heavier boot. But to have put that heavy boot on them when they went down to Valcartier camp, as I told you, there would have been more cripples than soldiers. . . These boots have been in service since 1904, I am told, and they have been very satisfactory for the purpose which they were used for.

Q. Would you consider the Canadian boot too heavy or too light for civilians?—A. I would consider that a very heavy boot for a civilian, yes.

It is not necessary to go any further in that line. You will find that the statements made in the minority report are picked out from detached pieces of the evidence, which, when you read them in connection with other parts, give a very different meaning. The minority also support their contention that it is not a suitable military boot, not only on the partly stated evidence of the witnesses I have mentioned but also on the report of the board presided over by Lieutenant-Colonel Hallick, which report was specially referred to the committee. I should like to point out what was said by the hon. member for Pictou in respect of that report by the Hallick board (page 36):

When I saw in the newspapers the evidence sworn to at the committee yesterday, that the witnesses examined at that investigation had never been sworn, one could only conclude that the whole thing was a farce. I do not know why we should be appointed a special committee of Parliament to investigate the report of an inquiry where the parties who were carrying it through did not think it serious enough to swear the witnesses they called. The mere ipse dixit and statements of people who appeared before this investigating board without pledging their oath, is, from a public standpoint, of no value whatever.

And further on he says:

We have to make our report to the House in regard to that report, because it was specially referred to us by the House. What Sir James Aikins says in regard to it is quite correct, the whole of the investigation and the report seemed to go on the assumption that boots were delivered in accordance with some specification, when it is quite clear that there were no specifications.....In so far as their report was a finding or a determination in regard to the question, my own personal opinion is that it was of no value.

I should like to know why he made the statement that their report was of no value.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does my hon. friend want me to answer that question?

Sir JAMES AIKINS: I can imagine the answer myself. Undoubtedly because he thought the very worst of that board's findings was more favourable to the Government than he imagined the best evidence given before the committee would be. Now that the evidence discloses a more favourable condition, he is greatly disappointed, and so in turn relies on the report. See what he says in respect to that report:

The opinion of the board may be summarized in so far as the character of the boot prescribed and supplied by the department, is concerned,—

Then he proceeds to give what he says is a summary, but he takes only part of it and omits the material balance, viz.:

The boots manufactured for the Canadian overseas division were generally speaking well made and of good quality—

Why does he omit that?

Surprisingly so, considering the very insufficient time given the contractors.

Why omit that in the summary? Because it does not suit his purpose. Yet he purports to send out to the Canadian people that misleading summary in his minority report. The Hallick report, from which he purports to give a summary, goes on to say that

Owing to the same extreme urgency, it appears that there was not enough time in which to consider how specifications for a boot differing with that which though suitable for a dry climate has been found to be unsuitable in the abnormal conditions in England. Consequently the board recommends the adoption of a heavier, stronger type of boot, similar to that used by the British Army.

What he gives as a summary is an unfair statement of the Hallick report. I have stated that the minority report did not mention in what respect the boot was unsuitable. I perhaps in that made a mistake. It does mention the point on which the boot was unsuitable by adopting the findings of the board, which says:

The boot was unsuitable for the soldiers and for the particular work for which they were provided because,—

(a) The shape is such that the average foot has not room for the free movement of the toes and is thus not suitable for marching.

The difficulty is in the shape, and yet when the inquiry was made of all these soldiers and persons who testified, only two persons, I think, said that there was any objection by reason of the particular shape of the boot. Yet the minority find that the boot is unsuitable because it is too narrow at the toe. Another point of unsuitability is stated:

Soles and heels not being reinforced with metal, soon wear down especially when wet.

Who disputes that fact? All that metal in the heels and soles does to the boot is to continue its wearing qualities. That does not add to the comfort of the boot, nor the flexibility of the sole nor the value of the leather that is put into it, only the length of its wearing. So they say that it is not suitable for active service because the toes are too narrow and they have not enough iron on the heels and soles. Therefore they condemn the Government because they have not issued a suitable boot, even though the boot was the same as the one adopted by the late Government. I say that they might well have joined in the report of the majority because the majority report points out these things as improvements. Let me read it to you from page 585 of the Votes and Proceedings:

Your committee conclude from the evidence given before it that for active service the sample boot would be improved by a second through sole instead of a slip-sole, (this change was made before the second orders for the Canadian boots were given and they were made accordingly); that it would be improved by putting more screws or nails in or quilting the outer sole so as to protect it from wear, and by making it wider at the toe (the large percentage of the boots supplied to the department since the beginning of the war were on a last wider at the toe); and by protecting the heel by nails or other iron material.

Is there any reason why the gentlemen who are asking us to adopt this minority report should not have joined in the majority report? Both concur in the desirability of a wider toe and more protection by nails or screws in the heel.

The minority report further says that the boot is unsuitable because:

The leather is dry, containing no grease, consequently quickly absorbs the water.

Let me point out what has been said in respect to that. Mr. H. W. Brown, director of contracts, page 112, gives the following evidence:

Q. Now, then, dealing with the question of the leather containing no water-resisting medium or other dressing, was there ever any pretence that that clause in the specification in regard to leather dressing or dubbing should be carried out by the contractors?—A. No.

Q. Special water-proof dubbing, water-proof? A. That was put in by Slater, I think he had some idea that by putting it in the specification he would be able to induce the department to buy it from his firm. We never bought it from him.

So that all that dubbing refers to is what may be done on the boot after it is constructed. Mr. S. M. Collis, at page 965, says:

Q. Were you the originator of winter calf? (That is the leather in the Government sample boots.)

—A. I was the first one who ever made it.

Q. You could show the difference between what is called winter calf and other calf?—A. Certainly.

Q. The winter calf and willow calf, as I understand, are exactly the same only one does not carry quite so much grease?—A. Willow calf is a skin that has been glazed or polished. That (pointing to exhibit) has not been polished; it has been finished up as winter calf. The willow calf is a skin that has been glazed and then boarded out. That has been boarded (pointing to exhibit). Of course you cannot give it so much grease because then you could not glaze it, it would not take the polish.

Then, Mr. Aubrey Davis, at page 611, says:

Q. Where do you carry on business?—A. In Newmarket, Ontario.

Q. What is the name of your firm?—A. The Davis Leather Co.

Q. Who is in that firm with you?—A. My father and two brothers.

Q. That is, the Hon. E. J. Davis?—A. Yes, and two brothers besides myself.

Q. What class of leather do you manufacture?—A. Calf leather entirely.

Q. Did you supply Messrs. Ames-Holden and Co. with calf leather?—A. We did.

Q. What quality of calf leather did you supply them?—A. With No. 1 tan storm for the army boots in the month of August.

Q. If they had no opportunity of drying you think there would be no leather that could stand that?—A. No, absolutely.

Q. In order to keep the leather it has got to have proper treatment?—A. It has got to have proper treatment.

Q. If it becomes wet it has to be dried and possibly treated with some oil or other substance of that class?—A. Certainly.

Then he goes on:

Q. Would you look at Exhibit 12 and say how that leather was treated?—A. This leather has been treated with an emulsion in the manufacture.

Q. And for general purposes, that is, for the usual wear, you would say the leather treated with emulsion is better than the other?—A. I certainly would.

Q. Would you even say that to the extent of the use of the boot for the army?—A. I would. I don't know whether I am transgressing or going too far afield—you can stop me if I do so—I realized the difficulty because I had a pair of army shoes that I was wearing myself and walking through the snow, I felt the dampness coming through the shoes.

Q. Whose make?—A. That pair of shoes was made by the E. T. Wright Co., of St. Thomas.

Q. Now, kindly proceed?—A. When I found this I immediately doctored the shoe with a treatment which we have used in our tannery for a good many years.... My experience with this pair of army boots made me think of the soldiers who were in the snow, and I suggested to my brothers that we should send a sample of this preparation to the officer in command of the expedition in Toronto.

Q. Then what developed?—A. Now, that is the same leather that the shoes were made from—the same leather as there, treated with the emulsion; consequently, that is the reason I brought it out, and I have no hesitation in saying that if the leather is properly treated with a proper kind of treatment, that leather can be kept perfectly waterproof in service, but of course a man must have a chance to let his shoes dry in order to get the preparation to take a proper effect on the shoes.

Q. Did you try this preparation yourself on the army shoes which you wore?—A. I did.

Q. And what did you find out?—A. It turned the snow water off entirely. I did not have a wet foot.

Why? Because he had used dubbing on his boots in the proper way, as any soldier might if given the dubbing or grease. Yet the minority report finds that the boot was unsuitable because it did not have enough grease to turn the water that can be obviated by the wearer. I have not time to mention what Mr. Matthews says on the very same subject, nor do I intend to delay the House. I have pointed out how unsupported is the statement that the samples furnished by the manufacturer were inferior to the sealed pattern. Then, when it comes to a question in what way the boot was unsuitable, the very best the hon. member for Pictou or the minority report can show is that it was too narrow in the toe, a little out in the shape, and had not qu iron enough on the heel and sole.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would the hon. g tleman wrestle with the question as what Mr. Hoar said about those boo namely, that they were not suitable fo campaign, or even to go out into the co try with?

Sir JAMES AIKINS: It is not support by the general evidence. The minority port begins by making a threatening no about the boots, about Government negle and winds up with only two points of u suitability. It reminds me of the story to of a man who had a pond on his place, a who asked a commission merchant if would buy from him a million frogs' leg He got an order for a hundred. He tramp around the edges of the pond and throu it, and found only three frogs, and reported to the commission merchan with the statement: "I thought from th noise the three made that there mu have been a million frogs in the swamp And so with these hon. gentlemen opposit one would think from the noise they mad that they had discovered something ver serious was wrong with the boots, but i the end they are limited to the complain that the toe was too narrow and that the was not enough steel on the sole and hee I submit that under these circumstance the amendment should not prevail.

Mr. F. S. SCOTT (South Waterloo): move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why not finish to-night

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is no one els going to speak on your side?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think so.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Then I woul like to say a few words before the ques tion is put.

This matter was brought to the attentio of the House in the early days of the ses sion by the right hon. the leader of the Op position; and, shortly after he mentione it, I informed the House that we purpose bringing down the report of the inquir which had been made on the subject, an that three gentlemen might be named o the other side of the House as members o a committee, which would be constitute of seven members for the purpose of goin fully into the matters which had beer alluded to. The committee then appointe have made a very exhaustive inquiry an the results of that inquiry have been brough

before the House in the form of two reports which have been discussed at great length, and into the details of which I do not intend to go at any great length at this late hour.

I want to point out in the first place that the gentlemen who have presented the minority report seem to have altogether overlooked, either intentionally or otherwise, the magnitude of the undertaking which was before this Government, when war broke out on the 4th of August last. The three hon. members who have seen fit to present the minority report to the House pose as critics, and they point out what might have been done, and what, in their judgment, ought to have been done; but it is well that the House and the country should remember what it meant in a country like this, with no great military organization, to undertake within a period of six weeks after the war broke out, the organization, equipment and despatch of a force of more than 32,000 men. When I remind hon. gentlemen that every one of these soldiers going to the front had to be equipped with sixty-six different articles for his own personal use, when I point out that the organization of a complete army division with all arms of the service, embraces an undertaking such as had never been dreamed of on a like scale in this country before; when one realizes in all its aspects the magnitude of the task which was undertaken by the Department of Militia and Defence, I venture to say that every one of us, looking back on these six weeks during which the first expeditionary force was prepared and sent forward, can only express the utmost surprise that the work was done as well as it turned out to have been done, and that so little cause of complaint has arisen.

Even in Great Britain, with a great military organization upon which the best thought of the nation has been directed ever since the South African war, they have had their difficulties in the equipment of their men since the opening of the war. I have under my hand reports from the Times and other great journals in the United Kingdom showing that even there, with all their marvellous organization, and with all the preparation that has been made for the past twenty years, difficulties have occurred on as great a scale, or perhaps a greater scale proportionately, than have occurred in Canada.

Even on this very question of the boots supplied to the troops, we have heard something in the United Kingdom. I have here a report of a debate in the House of Commons relating to the boots supplied to one battalion raised in England; and while it is perfectly true that the contract in this particular case was not a War Office contract, yet it was a contract of such a public nature that it was alluded to in Parliament. The debate took place on the 4th of March 1915, and Mr. Barlow, a responsible member of the British Parliament, made this statement:

> May I just quote one instance which came under my own personal observation? Boots were supplied to a battalion of which I have cognizance. They appeared to be excellent, they were passed by the local expert, and for them a high price was demanded.
>
> In appearance they were admirable boots. They were made of leather and looked charming. The only defect was that when they were put on the men's feet they would not hold together. The soles had a curious way of departing from the uppers—a practice which is not considered right in the best boot circles. After a good deal of struggle the contractor was forced to take the boots back. I cannot give the subsequent history, but a month or two later a further supply of boots was required for the battalion, and they were ordered according to sample. The new contractor said he could not supply the whole 2,000 pairs according to sample, but 1,500 were coming along just as good as the sample, and the regiment would, he was sure, be quite satisfied. The 1,500 pairs were supplied in due course, and they turned out to be a portion of the boots which had been rejected in the same warehouse for the same battalion. They were identical in every respect except that the price in the interval had risen by 1s. 9d.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You would not justify that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would not justify it for one moment, and I am not justifying it; but I am pointing out that even in Great Britain they have had their difficulties; and, so far as I am aware, no such wholesale defects have occurred in Canada.

I deeply regret that hon. gentlemen opposite seem to sympathize with efforts which have been made to discredit those who are engaged in the manufacture of boots in Canada; and I have not the slightest doubt that statements which have been made in the press and elsewhere, before this matter could be thoroughly investigated, have led to the detriment of business conditions in Canada and have deprived this country of contracts which it otherwise would have obtained, and in that way have taken the bread out of the mouths of Canadian workmen and their families. That is a very unworthy attempt for any man in Canada to undertake, whether he is or is not a member of this House.

I desire to allude to a matter which has been dealt with pretty fully by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, but which I would like to put in a very few words. There is no doubt at all that a certain type of boot had been selected and approved by the late Government at the time of the South African war. That will not be denied, because the boots which our men took to the South African war and wore there we e boots selected and approved by the late Administration. Is there any man who will deny that? There is not one. Then I say further that after the South African war the late Administration undertook to prepare and did prepare a better type of boot, as they imagined, in 1905. Is there any man who will deny that?

Mr. MACDONALD: They prepared it for the permanent force in Canada, not for active service.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. There is not one line or tittle of evidence from first to last that supports the statement my hon. friend has just now made, and I will come to that in a moment. I know that he procured some men on the witness stand to say that the boots were not suitable for active service.

Mr. MACDONALD: Everyone said it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: But see what that means. It means this, as was very well pointed out by my honorable friend the member for Brandon (Sir James Aikins). Here were millions of dollars being expended every year for military purposes in Canada. They were expended in the training and drilling of the men, in purchasing big guns, 18 pounders and 13 pounders, in providing rifles, bayonets and ammunition, in purchasing great coats and uniforms and clothing of other kinds as well as boots, caps, and equipment of every kind. These honourable gentlemen, the minority of the committee, have told us in the very first part of their report that one of the greatest essentials in the equipment of the soldier is the provision of a proper boot in order that his feet may be kept whole and that he can march with ease and comfort. Now they will have us believe that the boots deliberately selected and approved by the late Government, first in 1905 and afterwards considered and again approved in 1910, were not intended for use in war at all; that is to say, the honourable member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) desires us to believe—and it is understood that he had aspirations for the position now held by the Minister of Militia, and, I suppose he must be considered as speaking for the late Administration—that if war broke out, it was the intention of the late Administration not to put the men into the field at once to fight, but to call a board and ascertain what would be a suitable boot for war conditions and then spend six months or a year in providing them. The first act of mobilization by the late Administration would have been to call a board to provide that which they say is absolutely necessary for the soldier—a boot for active service conditions. That is the ridiculous position in which the honourable member for Pictou has undertaken to place the late Administration; and I think neither his leader nor the gentleman who held the position of Minister of Militia in the late Administration will be very much obliged to him. Could there be anything much more like comic opera? In the United States the best experts who could be procured in that great country took four years for the purpose of determining what would be the best type of army boot, and the first thing these honourable gentlemen opposite were to do when war broke out, if we are to believe the argument of the honourable member for Pictou, was to call a board which might take four years to determine the proper type of boot to be recommended. Their next active step in the war would be to let contracts for the purpose of having those boots supplied. According to the argument of the Opposition, the boots which the late Government adopted after much inquiry and consideration were peace boots; they were for soldiers, but they were purely peace boots. Were the soldiers' great-coats peace coats? Were their guns peace guns? Was their ammunition peace ammunition? Was every part of the equipment of the soldiers, according to the view of my honourable friend from Pictou, peace equipment? In that case, not only the boots, but the guns and the rifles and the ammunition and everything else would have to be discarded if war broke out, and an entirely new equipment procured for the soldiers.

Mr. MACDONALD: Oh, oh.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not wonder that the hon. member for Pictou laughs at his own argument, because I do not think anything more ridiculous was ever put forward.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am laughing at your argument.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is easily diverted. His own speech should provide him with an unending source of amusement. I believe he feels much concerned that he has put forward so absurd a proposition. His idea is absolutely and wholly ridiculous. I will follow my hon. friend's argument a little further. If the boots are not intended for active service, what is the soldier intended for? Was the soldier not intended for actice service? If the soldier was intended for active service, one would think that all his boots and other equipment were intended for active service; but, according to the argument of my hon. friend from Pictou, although the soldier was certainly intended for active service, yet an important part of his equipment, and what my hon. friend says is the most essential part of his equipment, was not intended for active service at all. I feel that such an argument deserves no more attention. My hon. friend from Pictou will be as much ashamed of it as any one else when he realizes where it really leads him into in regard to the position of the late Administration.

With regard to the type of boots selected by the late Government, I am not prepared at the moment to say that it was the best type of boot for active service that could possibly be selected; but it was the type which we found when we came into office; and after we came into office the expert officials of the Department of Militia and Defence, selected, not by us but by the late Administration, took the matter up again, and they said that it was a perfectly suitable type of boot, that they would adhere to it, and that they preferred it to the British type of boot. If my hon. friend desires to suggest that the officials of the Department of Militia and Defence, who have come to that conclusion and so reported to the minister, are not competent and able to discharge their duties, let him, or some other hon. gentleman opposite who is willing to take that responsibility, from his place in this House make that charge against those men. Up to the present time not one of them has seen fit to do so.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister took the responsibility himself of this particular boot being furnished. I quoted his statement before the committee to that effect.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I know what he said perfectly well, and I have read it. He said he thought this boot, on the whole, was better adapted for men in this country than would be the British boot which has been advocated by my hon. friends on the other side. And there is a good deal to be said in favour of that. What is the use of putting on the soldiers' feet boots which are strong and durable, it may be, but in which, after he has used them for four or five days, he cannot march. Every one knows that on this continent both civilians and soldiers wear a lighter type of boot than that used in the British Islands. And we know that the American Government, after four years of examination by the best experts they could procure, decided upon a type of boot just a little lighter than that adopted by the late Administration. After all, if you depend upon a man to march, in order to be effective, would it be better to place upon his feet boots in which he cannot march after three or four days' wear, or to place upon his feet boots in which he can march with the most perfect ease, and replace these boots when they are worn out? Does common sense teach us to take the one course or to take the other? The hon. member for Pictou and others who have concurred with him, apparently, are of opinion that if you place upon the soldier's feet a hard, unyielding boot, of a type such as he is not accustomed to, you will make him more effective even though he is absolutely unable to do his full duty in marching when so equipped.

I understand that the boots, with very trifling exceptions which have been supplied to the Canadian soldiers have been supplied according to the sample, and I am very glad indeed that the report which has been made in this House with regard to the quality of boots secured by the Government in the great stress and urgency of the early part of this war are such as reflect no discredit upon the Canadian manufacturers who supplied them.

My hon. friends on the other side of the House went to a great deal of trouble to show that the boots supplied, were not such as were used in South Africa. And they put the matter before the House and the country in a very insidious way. They say:

> That the boot supplied to the soldiers who went to South Africa was a different boot from the sealed sample boot of 1914, and from the boots supplied to the Overseas Forces. It was in 1905 that boots of a similar pattern to the 1914 boot were first adopted by the department for use in times of peace by the permanent forces in Canada.

"In times of peace" is absolutely interpolated. There is not a tittle of evidence to support their contention in that regard. I admit that the boot which was supplied in August last was a different boot from that

hich was supplied to the men who went South Africa. It was a different boot ecause it was a better boot—unless the peech of the hon. member for Pictou this ternoon is to be considered as a direct id forcible charge against the Administra-on of which he was a supporter for many ars in this Parliament. If it is not a tter boot, then he is raising against that dministration which he supported so long this House a direct challenge either ainst its good faith or its capacity, one or e other.

Now, I must assume that the hon. gentle-en who composed the minority of this mmittee desired to present a report to this ouse which would contain a fair state-nt of the facts and would present an biased view of the whole situation be-e the Parliament and people of Canada. would like to ask under these circum-nces why it was they absolutely sup-ssed in their report any reference what-r, so far as I can remember, to the ather conditions to which these boots re subjected both at Valcartier camp l on Salisbury Plain. They desired en they proposed that report that it uld be adopted by the whole committee. y proposed it as a report which con-ned a fair statement of the situation to Parliament and people of Canada. I any reasonable man in this House or this country whether he could come to conclusion that they did desire to be in their report when they absolutely minated any mention whatever of the ther conditions under which these ts were issued. And yet, notwithstanding se weather conditions, we have the evid-e of witness after witness that the boots plied to them at Valcartier camp stood n in good stead for ten weeks in the st conditions that were ever known at season, and that after ten weeks of wear they were still perfectly good boots. This evidence stared them 2 m. in the face, and there is not one single reference to it in the r" report of hon. gentlemen opposite. reason for this is plain—their partisan-collided with their patriotism and the r was very quickly dissipated. There reference whatever in their report to testimony of the men who used these s on Salisbury Plain. That would not onsistent with their idea of endeavour-o make a little, petty party capital out great national question.

. MACDONALD: If the right hon. eman will permit me, I would like

r Robert Borden.]

to point out that on page 597 of the Votes and Proceedings, he will find this:

> That owing to the fact that the boots supplied for the First Overseas Contingent at Valcartier and in England, were not available for our examination, the evidence, with the exception of a few isolated witnesses submitted to us as to these boots, rests upon the reports of the Regimental boards in England and of General Alderson and other Officers there, and the statement of Sir George Perley;

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not prepared to accept that view of the situation. If my hon. friend will turn to page 588, he will find reference to the evidence of three credible witnesses, Mr. W. M. Bennett of Walkerville, ex-Sergeant Nussey, of the Princess Patricias, and Corporal Edwards; also the evidence of the Minister of Militia on the same page, and on the following page the evidence of Private Ross. All of these witnesses, except the Minister, speak of having used these boots under the awful conditions, the worst that have been known for forty years, on Salisbury Plain, and the boots, notwithstanding these conditions, had done good service. I would think that hon. gentlemen who desired to be fair, to place before the people of this country an unprejudiced and unbiased statement as to the boots in question, would naturally and necessarily have made some allusion to that.

A great deal has been said by several hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House with regard to delay in ordering new boots and with regard to a report of a Sub-Committee of the Council. So far as that is concerned the matter is capable of the most perfect explanation and it is this: After a Sub-Committee of Council had taken the matter into consideration, and after it had been proposed to issue orders for boots of a type and character then recommended by certain manufacturers, who, of course, were highly desirous that orders should go out as quickly as possible, we had further suggestions and further advice as to the type of boot that ought to be adopted. It had taken the Government of the United States four years, with the assistance of the best experts on this continent, to come to a conclusion. We had the decision of the late Administration, supported by all the technical officers of the Department with regard to the boot then in use, and we did not propose precipitately to make a change without the most careful consideration of the character and type of the new boot. The Minister of Militia, in consulting me, said he thought it would be better to wait until

Committee of this House had reported, ıuse suggestions might be made by the mittee whose report is now before the se, which would enable us better to e to a conclusion as to the type of boot ch should be ordered.

these three members of the com- ee, who were more concerned in r matters than the best type of which could be selected for the adian soldier, had devoted a little more ntion to that question and had endeav- d to assist the Government and the ple of this country in choosing a type of , which might be superior to that which late Government had selected in the instance, it would perhaps have been er for all concerned. But their minds entirely on other subjects, and chiefly, ot altogether, on the question of how e petty political capital might be made nst the Government of the country, not the question of what would be the best of boot to be supplied. The Minister of tia, in my judgment, took a perfectly ect course in waiting until he had the ntage of the advice of this committee, ıy advantage could be derived from it; in the report of the majority of the mittee who were concerned in this ques- and not with the pettier questions h absorbed entirely the minds of the ority. There are some suggestions which hall take into consideration and which otless will be helpful in the end.

respect of this matter, and indeed of y matter that is concerned with the aration of equipment for our troops, I desirous that there should be the st and most ample investigation; and ink our record through the session has onstrated not only our willingness but desire that every matter brought up in House, which might afford the slightest icion of improper dealings, should be ed to the bottom. We were not only ng, but we insisted that it should be ed to the bottom, and we shall continue o so until the end.

far as this matter is concerned, I am glad indeed to know that the action of Government has been sustained not by the majority of the committee, but, r than that, by the evidence given re the committee. We had to under- this tremendous task of equipping a t army at almost a moment's notice, inside of six weeks we sent out nearly 0 men, fully equipped, with all the plex organization that is necessary for an army at the front under modern conditions. Among other things a great number of boots had to be supplied. What we did was to take the type of boot which had been adopted by the late Government in 1905, and had been readopted by them in 1910, which had been approved by the technical men, then and now the advisers of the Minister of Militia; we went to the manufacturers of this country and asked them to supply those boots much more rapidly than they would be expected to do under ordinary conditions. With these boots we equipped the soldiers who have gone to the front. It would be a strange thing indeed, under those circumstances, and with the weather conditions which supervened both at Valcartier camp and at Salisbury Plain, if the boots did not give way now and then and if some complaints were not made. But I am glad to say that the result as a whole has demonstrated not only the fairness and the honesty of the manufacturers of Canada, but also the efficiency of the Department of Militia and Defence, and the ability of the people of this country to deal with so great an emergency in a prompt and efficient way.

Major General HUGHES (Minister of Militia): I was hoping that some worthy gentleman on the other side would have prolonged this debate so that we might have adjourned it until the morrow, as I wanted to speak at considerable length; but at this hour of the evening I shall endeavour to condense my remarks to a minimum.

The first I heard of anything wrong in connection with the boots issued to the soldiers of Canada was on my return from the old land towards the latter end of November. Soon after I took occasion to visit one of the centres whence adverse reports had come, St. Johns, Que. I found there about 30 pairs of boot that had been reported by Colonel Gaudette as being inferior. We examined some that were cut across the soles which to my mind had been burned. Two or three others were worn and one or two had the outer sole torn off, whether by accident or design I could not say. However, the report had been published in the newspapers that the boots were bad. Any one familiar with the spirit or temper of the Canadian people or any people who have not been accustomed to war under such conditions as have prevailed in Canada ever since the outbreak of war will readily realize the nervous tension affecting the people. For instance, a toy balloon crossing over the border near Brockville set

the whole community agog, it was an American invasion. A kite flying over Ottawa stampeded the whole city on one or two occasions; and some persons having been heard speaking the German language near Toronto caused a great agitation in that city on an occasion not very long since. In many ways we have evidence that a certain number of people of the country are more or less readily stampeded, if I may use the term, by these irrelevant matters in connection with the war.

The temper of the people is sensitive at a time like this, and one can readily understand how they would feel at the first whisper that the boots supplied to the soldiers were poor. We had faith in the great majority of the manufacturers. We believed that they were absolutely honest and square in their dealings. I may say that a great number of them pledged their word that the quality of leather and the workmanship was not only fully up to the standard but above the standard, and that they were turning out a better boot than the contract called for. Almost every manufacturer gave us that pledge. When I heard of complaints, I immediately ordered the boards to report on these boots, and later on appointed a board from my own department to investigate and report. Their report is now before the House. At first it was believed—and the newspapers took up the agitation—that there was truth in these charges, but as I passed from regiment to regiment and personally investigated, I found that instead of the filling being of jam mixed with cork, as some of the stories had it, the filling was of the highest standard that could be put in boots. It was wax, mixed with cork, which is what the specifications call for. Furthermore, as I went through the country I found very few places where more than a dozen pairs were defective at all, and then it began to dawn on me that there must be something more behind all this, than the good of the soldier or the bad quality of his boots. Every facility the department could afford has been offered to the committee in their investigation; in fact, I had the honour of requesting the first minister to appoint the committee to inquire into the whole question.

I might point out, in connection with my views on the boot question, that some years ago I visited the city of Washington and investigated the American plans of boot making, and what they considered the proper boot for a soldier. It is generally known that the American boot is somewhat lighter than the so-called Canadian dancing pump. It also has a very broad toe, much too broad to my mind. I purchased a pair once that were supposed to be perfect, but I found that the toe played around inside too much and that the boot was much more uncomfortable than a boot that fitted more snugly. As I told the committee, one of our sample boots exhibited before them would have been better if it had been a trifle broader. I also pointed out that the toes and heels should be nailed, for wearing.

The Canadian boot has stood the wear and tear beyond all expectations. When the troops went to England they were met with adverse weather conditions at Salisbury Plains. The rain poured down day after day, and the men had to walk around in mud up to the ankles. No boots ever manufactured, whether in England or in Canada, could stand such weather as that. No boots have stood such weather. It is only natural that the Canadian boot, the only ones that were being worn there, should be the only ones to be criticised—at that time the English boot was not being worn by our soldiers. Finally, when the agitation from here reached England, the boys naturally thought: Oh, these boots must really be bad. At all events the boots were exchanged for English boots, but fortunately for themselves the boys still preserved their Valcartier boots. We have evidence after evidence to show that the British boot has gone clean to pieces. The heavy sole is not proving satisfactory to the English soldier, and to-night in the trenches in France and Belgium the Canadian soldiers are wearing their old Canadian boots, 90 per cent of them having discarded the English boot. The Evening Telegram of Toronto, a paper which cannot be charged with being too friendly to your humble servant, in its issue of February 19, 1915, contains an article from Gorden Dent, one of three brothers at the front. He says:

> I guess you have heard about the Canadian boots being no good. Well, they are all right, on my first pair the soles are only worn out and they can be made as good as new. What destroyed them was some of the fellows put them over the stove to dry, which rotted them. The first issue of English boots I happened to get (worse luck) they were fitted to a 2 x 4 plank and there is no support whatever to the arch of the foot, and the leather is rotten. A complaint was made and they stopped issuing them, and now they have got another kind which are some improvement, but let me half-sole my Canadian boots and hob-nail them and I will out-walk any person who has the English boots.

I have also an extract from a letter from Douglas Jennings to C. A. B. Jennings. It is dated Levington Manor, Wilts, March 9, 1915, and reads as follows:

> They have equipped us with those English boots, steel heels and those great large hob nails in the bottoms. I am afraid they are going to ruin my feet, for they are very heavy and hard to break in. On pay day I am going to buy myself a pair of boots that I can get some comfort out of, for if I have to do the marches in full marching order that we get I will be a cripple in a very short time.

Here is an extract from a letter written by a soldier on Salisbury Plain to his parents residing in Ottawa:

> February 1, 1915.
>
> I notice that the Canadian boots were condemned. Ninety per cent of the men here cannot wear the English make and want to wear the Canadian boots. I am going to leave the English make behind, and wear the ones from home, as they are more comfortable, although they might not be able to stand as much wear and tear.

A week ago, a soldier who had been invalided from the front, having been wounded by a shrapnel shell, passed through Ottawa on his way to Edmonton. On the way from Montreal to here he showed the folks the boots he had worn at Valcartier and at Salisbury Plain and in the trenches, and which I presume he is wearing in Edmonton to-night. I can also quote an extract from a very distinguished officer at the front. He says: "Our Canadian boots are better than the English. The latter have gone to pieces much worse than the Canadian boots." This bears out Major Currie's statement that the Canadian boots that stood the water at Valcartier, but which were discarded by arrangements with the British authorities, have had to be taken up again by the soldiers, 90 per cent of whom are wearing them in the trenches at the present moment.

I shall not take up any more of the time of the House except to point out this. Some of our wagons were discarded. One of the reasons given was that they could not turn in the narrow English roads. I knew that was nonsense, because the Canadian wagon can turn in 31 feet 9 inches, whereas the English wagon takes 35 feet. It was also said that our trucks were not satisfactory at the front, that we had three kinds of trucks. Instead of their having been discarded, however, it turns out now that we are supplying seven kinds of trucks. Our bicycles, which were discarded, have also turned out better than the English, and are now being adopted. Our boots were discarded, and they are now turning out better than the English boots.

In regard to the boots furnished to the Canadian contingent at the time of the South African war the facts are these. The inferior boot which was shown here to-night was the one supplied to the troops but the defects were found in them before they started and a number were returned. A large number of a slightly different make were subsequently purchased and handed out to the troops but the troops would not wear them. The troops, out of their own pockets, largely purchased the Slater shoe and wore them through the South African campaign. It is not correct to say that the Slater shoe was issued to soldiers in South Africa because as a matter of fact it was not. The Slater shoe was bought individually by the soldiers and worn by them through the war. Later on the Slater shoe was adopted by the department and Charles Slater, I think the gentleman's name is, was the gentleman who was intrumental in having that shoe adopted. It remained the standard shoe for the department but was remodelled in 1910. In that year I had the honour of being consulted about the shoe and I gave my views which are very much in favour of a light shoe.

I have always worn a light shoe and I have always felt that it was much better for marching purposes. I have never felt any difficulty in wearing a light shoe and I could outmarch men wearing heavy boots. The great trouble with the heavy boot is that unless it is kept well oiled and in a flexible condition it wrinkles and the result is that the soldier wearing it is incapacitated. I prefer a light upper made of flexible leather. If I had my way I would have mercurial tanned leather. As an instance of a light boot I might point to what is well known by any one who has studied Highland customs, that the Highland soldier in the olden days, when he was a distinct and superior individual to an even greater degree than he is to-day, wore what one might almost call slippers or shoes very much the same as our running shoes. In my own experience of mountain climbing I have found that the best results come from wearing a sporting or lacrosse shoe. I have no use for the heavy boot. The German and British soldiers wear the heavy boot. The German soldier wears a boot that is much larger than would ordinarily be necessary because he wraps his feet in flannel cloth while the British soldier wears a woollen sock. The French soldier wears a much lighter shoe than the British

or German soldier, the Italian soldier wears a light shoe, the Canadian soldier wears a light shoe and the American soldier wears the lightest shoe of all, some lined and some unlined. The American shoe is lighter than the so-called dancing pump of the Canadian soldier.

I do not wish to detain the House other than to point out that I understood from the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the suspicion of fraud on the part of the manufacturers was the motive for appointing this committee of investigation. As time wore on we found that there was no attempt to show that there had been any fraud on the part of the manufacturers, and I presume that there was no opportunity of doing so, because there was no evidence of fraud.

The question naturally suggests itself to me: Are these hon. gentlemen doing this for the benefit of the soldiers? Not at all. The soldiers were perfectly content with these boots, and in the Dominion of Canada there are tens of thousands of soldiers wearing them. They were wearing them last fall, they have been wearing them all winter, and they are wearing them this spring, and there is no fault to find with the boots. The other day one dear lady came to me in the city of Ottawa, and she said: "It is an awful thing; I saw a poor soldier walking around with his foot actually out of his boot." I said: "That is absolutely impossible." She said: "I saw it myself. There is cloth on his feet." I said: "You must be mistaken; the soldiers are furnished with overshoes in the winter time," and she replied: "Oh, I did not know that." Any one in a snowy country wears overshoes in the winter. We had these overshoes for the men all winter, and they were offered to the men at Salisbury Plain, but they were discarded there because it was thought desirable to supplement the boots with which they were equipped.

This agitation certainly could not have been intended to promote Canadian industry. A gentleman told me that at the time this agitation commenced there were negotiations in progress for a $3,000,000 order for boots for the Russian Government, to be given to Canadian manufacturers, but as soon as this agitation began the order was cancelled and it was transferred to United States firms. This agitation, undertaken for political purposes, was utilized for commercial purposes by rival manufacturers in other countries.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the minister evidence in writing of the statement he has made, and, if so, will he be good enough to submit it to the House?

Major General HUGHES: Submit what to the House?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister stated that as a result of this matter having been brought up—this matter of the quality of these boots which were furnished and for which he claims this side of the House is responsible—

Major General HUGHES: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: —an order for $3,000,000, worth of boots and shoes, which otherwise would have gone to Canadian manufacturers, was transferred to the United States. That is a very important statement to make, and if the minister has any written evidence of it, would he submit it to the House? I would ask the minister if he would do so.

Major General HUGHES: Do what?

Mr. PUGSLEY: If he would submit the evidence to the House.

Major General HUGHES: I have submitted the evidence. The honorable gentleman has asked me for the evidence. I have given him my statement. Not a dollar's worth of Canadian boots have been sent to Russia, France—

Mr. MACDONALD: Oh, yes.

Major General HUGHES: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. MACDONALD: My honorable friend is mistaken there. We had evidence before the committee that a Montreal firm had a contract for supplying boots to those countries.

Major General HUGHES: Well, I was not aware of that. I have reason to believe that there would have been millions of dollars' worth sent to this country had this agitation not been carried on.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let me ask the minister if it is the case that the remark which was attributed to him in the newspapers that the manufacturer who supplied these poor boots ought to be shot could have had some influence upon the Russian Government.

Major General HUGHES: The remark that was attributed to me was that shooting was too good for the manufacturer who made bad boots and furnished them to the soldiers, but that was after the honourable gentlemen opposite had been instrumental in developing this agitation.

Mr. MACDONALD: No, it was not.

Major General HUGHES: I made my statement in the middle of January.

Mr. MACDONALD: That was before the House met.

Major General HUGHES: But the agitation was going on before I came back from England.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It was broadcast among the soldiers, of course.

Major General HUGHES: Not at all; the soldiers were content. This agitation was not carried on for the benefit of the people.

Mr. MACDONALD: The soldiers started it themselves.

Major General HUGHES: The agitation was not started by the soldiers themselves. It was started in the press of the country and it was not carried on for the upbuilding of the Empire. I have studied the matter from every viewpoint, and no aspect presents itself that can be regarded as having any interest for the people of Canada. This agitation has only been carried on for the benefit of rival manufacturers in other lands and for the benefit of the political party that is now occupying the Opposition and will long continue to occupy that position in this Parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the minister not aware that one newspaper that started the agitation in a most active way was that very leading Canadian newspaper in Montreal, the Montreal Star, which cannot be accused of favouring the Liberal party?

Major General HUGHES: No matter how it was started, it was very quickly taken up by our friends opposite. I was pointing out that the soldiers on the other side of the Atlantic, as well as this side, as soon as they saw that the agitation was merely political or commercial, settled down and refused to take any part in it. The soldiers on the other side to a man and the soldiers in the firing line in France, are wearing the soft leather boot in preference to the English hard leather boot. The English hard leather boot has not stood the wear for any two months on an average. In fact, they are issuing hard leather boots to the British soldier and they get an issue every two months or six weeks. The Canadian boots are better than the English boots; the latter have gone to pieces much worse than have the Canadian boots. Thousands of the Canadian boots supplied at Valcartier are to-day being worn by the soldiers at the front, which is a marvel for service and to my mind is more than creditable to our Canadian boot manufacturers. I shall not detain the House further at this late hour, as the matter can be discussed in case of need on other occasions.

Amendment (Mr. Murphy) lost on division.

Motion (Mr. Middlebro) agreed to on division.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. Tuesday.

Tuesday, April 13, 1915.

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

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.

RELEASE OF THOMAS RILEY.

On the Orders of the Day being called

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) if his attention has been called to an item which appears in Saturday's Free Press, and which is also referred to in this morning's Ottawa Citizen, in regard to the release of one Thomas Riley from Kingston Penitentiary. It is reported in both articles that there were two Rileys in that institution and that the one who was sentenced about a year ago to fifteen years for manslaughter was by mistake released for the other Riley. If this is true it certainly reflects very strongly on the administration or management of that institution. I would ask the minister if his attention has been called to this fact.

Mr. DOHERTY: My attention was brought to the fact. What happened was this: an application was made on behalf of Thomas Riley, convicted of manslaughter in April, 1913, and sentenced to seven years. After consideration of the case a recommendation was made and was acted upon by His Royal Highness the Governor General approving an order for the release of this man, whose offence was, as I have stated, with all the circumstances on the face of it. Unfortunately there was in the same penitentiary another Thomas Riley who had been sentenced likewise for manslaughter in April,

1914, and who had been sentenced to fifteen years. I should say that the one difference between the two men, and this is where the very unfortunate error occurred, was that the man who had been sentenced to fifteen years had a middle initial in his name; his name was Thomas M. Riley. When the order went from the Secretary of State's Dearitment to the warden it contained no information in regard to the individual, but described him as Thomas M. Riley. Thomas M. Riley was, upon that order, discharged, although the recommendation approved by His Royal Highness was for the discharge of the other man. The "M" got slipped into the papers because of a report that was on the files on the question of the deportability of the fifteen-year man. The incident is, of course, most regrettable. What it makes most clear is that in the communication of these orders more care should be taken to give not only the man's name, but every circumstance surrounding him so as to make a mistake of identity impossible. I do not know that it is going to help things to direct public attention to it, but I may inform the House that steps are being taken to re-arrest and return to the penitentiary the man for whose discharge no order of His Royal Highness was issued and who, through this unfortunate combination of circumstances, in effect escaped from the penitentiary. We have initiated steps to remedy the mistake that occurred.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Are you going to ask for extradition?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have given instructions that the matter be taken up from that point of view.

Mr. McKENZIE: I presume the minister is going to let out the right man?

Mr. DOHERTY: That is not at all an unnatural presumption. Most assuredly there is a proper order for the discharge of that man, and the proper action would be to discharge him. The mere fact that the message unfortunately did not convey the correct information should not prejudice the man whose discharge was ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

REPORT OF MR. FERGUSON.

On the Order of the Day being called:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There was a report laid on the table of the House two or three days ago of an investigation conducted by Mr. Ferguson, who, it appears, has been entrusted by the Government to make an investigation into certain matters under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The report is very voluminous. When I commenced to read it I found that there was no reference to the powers of Mr. Ferguson o rthe nature of the duties which were assigned to him. The Order in Council which appointed him has not been brought down. Will the Government have it brought down immediately?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: When was the document laid on the table of the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: A couple of days ago.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. S. F. GLASS (Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I desire to rise to a matter of privilege. I am sorry that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) is not in his seat this morning, because I desire to direct the attention of the House to some remarks he is reported to have made on Saturday last in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. There is an article in the London Advertiser of yesterday headed, "Appeal for Blood-suckers," and containing the report of a speech delivered by the hon. member for West Lambton. Speaking at a Liberal convention held in the city of London last Saturday, to nominate a candidate for the Dominion House, he said:

> Then along comes the Finance Minister, White, a very practical farmer is Mr. White, having come direct from an office in Toronto, and he says to you farmers: "Pay a little more, have a little more patriotism and a little more production and pay more blood money in order that the suckers may be kept going."
>
> Then of this 5 per cent. The Tories have been shouting "Loyalty." They always have. They have the only simon pure brand of loyalty concealed about them. The Grits are disloyal. They want annexation. They are not British subjects.
>
> The Tories did not oppose reciprocity on economic grounds—they couldn't,—so they came to you farmers and said that while reciprocity would give you bigger markets and better prices you should not vote for it because if it carried it would weaken the bonds of the Empire and Canada would become annexed to the United States.
>
> They waved the flag. They called themselves the paragon of loyalty and called on Ontario to look at them. Ontario did look and it must have been through a magnifying glass for we were left with a shattered 13. However, I have no fault to find. It was foolish but every man's destiny is his own. Ontario was afraid of the bugbear of loyalty.

How loyal are the Tories of to-day?

What do the Conservatives say? Do they show consistency? Their arguments of loyalty don't go. The arguments that they are Tories from the ground up are accepted. They called on the British-born not to support the Liberal party because it was disloyal and would not support the British Empire. What will the British-born do now?

Last week I heard your present representative, S. F. Glass, endeavouring to justify the seven and a half per cent increase. He said: "If it wasn't for this row would we satisfy the manufacturers?" (Laughter.) In that one short sentence the whole trend of the policy of the Tories is shown. It is "fatten up the manufacturers and don't worry about the farmer. He will come."

If my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) were in the House now, I should like to ask him if he has been correctly reported; and judging from the construction of the sentences, I rather believe he has not. But I do want to say that every word in that statement, from beginning to end, both in its sentiment and its construction, is absolutely false, and Hansard will show that I was not properly quoted. The object no doubt was to prejudice me before the farmers who were present. I take this opportunity, if the hon. gentleman is reported correctly, to say that the statements he made are absolutely false and without a tittle of foundation.

Mr. SPEAKER: With reference to the practice which seems to be somewhat prevalent of late, of reading newspaper articles in the House as a question of privilege, I wish to say that it is not a question of privilege, and cannot by any stretch of the imagination be properly regarded as privilege. All the same, it is the right of an hon. member to refer to such statements and to contradict them.

WAR SUPPLIES.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH MANUFACTURERS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the absence of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), and at his request, I wish to ask the Prime Minister if he has yet obtained the consent which he said was necessary before bringing down certain correspondence which took place between the manufacturers and this Government in regard to the mode in which orders for war supplies were given.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I communicated with the gentleman who wrote me the letter, but I have not yet received a reply.

PURCHASES FOR THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. PUGSLEY: I call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the following article which appeared in the Ottawa Free Press of last evening, and I shall base a question upon it.

British Government will send out its own Buyers.

Revelations of war purchases on boots, bandages, binoculars and bad horses apparently have crossed the Atlantic.

It looks as if the British Government had begun to sit up and take notice. Soon after the opening of the war the British Government entrusted the Canadian Government with the purchasing of some war supplies in Canada for the use of the British and allied forces. The British Government was to pay the bills.

It is understood that within the last few days the War Office or the British Government has cancelled the buying commissions which it gave to the Canadian Government.

This does not mean an end to the purchase of supplies in Canada by the British Government, as War Office buyers are on their way to Canada and the United States, and hereafter the British Government will deal direct with producers and manufacturers on this continent without the intervention of Ottawa.

I ask the Minister of Militia if the Government has received notice from the British War Office that they are sending their agents to the United States and Canada for the purpose of making purchases direct from the manufacturers, and are not to continue making them through my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and others who have been appointed by him?

Major General HUGHES: The hon. gentleman asks me a question concerning the Department of Militia, and I am in the happy position of being able to answer him. There is not a word of truth in that article, so far as the Department of Militia is concerned. So far as the Government is concerned, the Prime Minister is the proper gentleman to ask.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The statements in the article are absolutely without foundation, so far as I am aware. On the contrary, I know that within the past four or five days the British Government have asked the Canadian Government to act in respect of the procuring of a large amount of supplies in Canada for the War Office.

INQUIRY FOR A RETURN.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. McKENZIE: I again call the attention of the Secretary of State to the order

I moved for some time ago, which principally concerns the Department of Railways. The Minister of Railways tells me he sent his return to the Secretary of State. I trust the return will be brought down, because we have evidently only a few days of the session left.

Mr. CODERRE: What is the return about?

Mr. McKENZIE: There is only one return of mine, and it is easily found if it is there at all. It is about certain correspondence between Mr. Douglas, provincial member for the county of Cape Breton and the departments of the Government.

Mr. COCHRANE: I may tell my hon. friend that I had no correspondence with the gentleman in question.

SOLDIERS' VOTING BILL.

The House again went into committee, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair, on Bill No. 111, to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise.—Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice).

Mr. DOHERTY: This Bill has been reprinted so as to have inserted certain amendments and alterations, some as the result of discussion in committee, and some as the result of further consideration on our part. Yesterday there was distributed a reprint in which there were a number of clerical errors, and in which there was inserted a section which I might describe as a tentative section looking to give effect to a suggestion which emanated from the right hon. leader of the Opposition. This section was inserted by mistake, because I did not intend to have it inserted in the Bill until after I had had an opportunity of submitting it to the right hon. gentleman. I do not want to suggest that I am not willing to carry out the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman if we can agree upon the best form in which to carry it out; but, by reason of the errors requiring to be corrected and the insertion of this section, I have caused a correct reprint to be made, and I will have copies of the Bill as reprinted handed around. It is substantially the same as the reprint issued yesterday, with the exception that the section to which I have referred is omitted, the other alterations being merely verbal corrections. I understand that we have dealt with the first two sections; but, if it is desired to take them up again, I have no objection.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the first section the same as the first section in the original Bill?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no alteration in the first section.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What about the second section?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no alteration in the second section. The committee will notice that a heading has been inserted between the first section and the second section. This is the distinction between the portions of the Bill which deal with volunteers outside of Canada and the portions of the Bill which deal with volunteers in Canada. The dispositions with regard to the latter begin with section 4.

Mr. NESBITT: There are certain changes in the first section.

Mr. DOHERTY: To what effect?

Mr. NESBITT: Certain words have been dropped out.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no change in the section as it passed the committee on Saturday, although there is a change in the section as originally drafted.

Mr. NESBITT: There is a change in the printing.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman has not indicated in what the change consists.

Mr. MURPHY: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the first section in the reprint is the same as the first section in the original Bill?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, but there is no change in it as it passed the committee on Saturday last.

Mr. NESBITT: That may be true, but I am speaking about the Bill as first printed.

Mr. DOHERTY: The first section in the Bill as originally introduced was amended in the committee on Saturday last, and the first section as now printed is the section as it passed the committee in accordance with the amendments made.

On section 1—soldiers entitled to vote:

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister made a distinction between the volunteers and the regulars?

Mr. DOHERTY: According to the first section the word "volunteer" covers any person serving in the military forces of Canada at the present moment.

Mr. VERVILLE: Is schedule A, which describes the manner in which the soldier is to vote, applicable to section 1 of the Bill? Schedule A corresponds with section 2, but section 1 does not say anything as to how volunteers in Canada are to vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: We are dealing now with volunteers outside of Canada, and we shall deal in due course with volunteers in Canada. The form A of ballot is exactly the form of ballot used in every election in Canada. To put it beyond doubt that the ballot as printed reproduces the actual ballot, I will, if the committee will consent, instead of the printing in the Bill, put upon the official copy one of the actual ballots. I want to make it quite clear that the soldiers of both classes are to use exactly the ballot that is used in Canada, save that a soldier voting outside of Canada, instead of having a ballot on which the names of the candidates are, will have a ballot the spaces of which will be filled in the manner provided in schedule A. There is no difference in the form itself; the difference between the ballot actually used under the Dominion Elections Act and this ballot consists in the fact—and the difference exists only with regard to overseas votes—that instead of names of candidates being printed in the white spaces, the words found upon the form are to be printed. In every other respect the ballot is absolutely the ballot used under the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the statement which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has made, that his mind has been moving towards acting upon the suggestion made by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition with regard to adopting some provision which will make the Bill more satisfactory to all parties and perhaps throw around it safeguards which it is recognized ought to be thrown around the taking of the ballots of absent electors, is certainly calculated to make one believe that it will be possible for us all to agree upon a measure having that end in view. It is a little embarrassing, because my hon. friend has had the Bill reprinted with a clause looking to the appointment of scrutineers or commissioners, and another printed leaving that out. It is difficult to discuss the provisions of a new Bill—for this is practically a new Bill—across the floor of the House without having had time to study it. I would suggest, in view of these new provisions and of the suggestion the hon. gentleman has made, that it might be well to appoint a small committee, representing both sides, to go into this matter. I think that the idea of scrutineers and commissioners is a good one; it provides safeguards which are acceptable. I should think, however, that the powers of the commissioners should go somewhat further than the amendment provides, and that they should have in a large measure the control of the taking of the vote. If the Minister of Justice and the right hon. leader of the Opposition could get together, probably a Bill could be framed that would be acceptable.

Mr. DOHERTY: As to the clause to which the hon. member refers, I have already explained that it was a little premature to print it, for I understood that it was drawn as a tentative clause. I had a few words in consultation with the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) about it, and it seemed to me it did not quite meet his views, and was not, perhaps, as practical as I would like to see it. I had not expected that it would appear in the reprinted Bill; and, inasmuch as there were other clerical errors, I had these corrected also and the Bill reprinted in that form. I am in hopes that, with discussion, we may be able to draft a clause that will be satisfactory and that will give effect to his suggestion as I understood it.

As to the suggestion that the Bill should be dealt with by a small committee, I think that might be a proper course. But I am in hopes also that there are a large number of the provisions in the Bill on which we can agree in Committee of the Whole. In that way we can greatly limit the scope of the reference made to the special committee. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) would accept this modification of his suggestion, we might act upon it. We might go through the Bill, allowing to stand for reference to a special committee such clauses as require more careful consideration.

Mr. OLIVER: If clause 1 is still open for discussion, I wish to reiterate my objection to the proviso. First, I would urge the same reason I gave before—that this makes a double qualification and, owing to the amendment the hon. gentleman has made this proviso is unnecessary to give a fair and reasonable opportunity to vote. Another reason against this is that the hon. gentleman has made a third qualification. I submit that that is mixing it up too much. I quite approve of the third qualification; but when he has the first qualification, that

of the place of enlistment, and also the third, that of voting within the electoral district where the man belongs, there is no need, I submit, for this proviso. I do not wish to make a motion to strike it out, but simply to put myself on record.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—distribution of ballot papers:

Mr. OLIVER: I observe that the ballots are to be sent to the commander of the forces in Bermuda, and later on it is provided that the commander of the forces in Bermuda is to control the handling of the ballots. I thought it was understood that the commander of the forces was not to have the handling of the ballots, but that under a later section it was provided that the balloting should be done under the paymaster. Is it not in order to make the same provision in regard to Bermuda as in regard to the other forces?

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, the paymaster of the Canadian expeditionary forces is in England so that we could not very well bring the Bermuda forces under the general provisions under which the ballots would emanate from the chief paymaster. And, as regards Bermuda, after all, we have only to deal with one regiment of 982 men. It would be a very extraordinary system to send these ballots to the paymaster and all the more so because he does not pay these men, as I understand it. He is chief paymaster of the Canadian expeditionary forces, but I understand that the men in Bermuda do not form a part of these forces. They are doing garrison duty there, having been detached for that purpose. If it is thought that the commanding officer is a particularly objectionable man to do this duty, I suppose we could say that the paymaster of that one particular regiment should distribute the ballots. The hon. member will understand that the only thing the commanding officer has to do with these ballots is to distribute them to the officers commanding companies; that is the beginning and end of his work; the rest is done by the officers commanding companies and the volunteers to whom they distribute the ballots. The commanding officer is the mere instrument of handing out the ballots to the officers who are to take the votes.

Mr. GERMAN: I do not see that it makes any difference whether the ballots are sent to the commanding officer or to the paymaster. The objection that I have, and the objection that I believe the people will have, is that under this legislation there will be an indiscriminate circulation of ballot papers by the commanding officer or paymaster among the officers commanding squadrons, companies and batteries, and that the soldiers will vote higgledy-piggledy, if I may use the expression, without any guarantee that the votes shall be properly recorded. There will be no supervision; it will be done simply as the commanding officer may wish to have it done, if he has strong political convictions and desires to have the votes recorded in favour of the party in which he may have an active interest. Is a man commanding a company, because he is in uniform, going to conduct the casting of these ballots more properly than a man at home, who is not in uniform? There is no supervision over his conduct; he may do exactly what he likes. As I stated in the few remarks that I made on the second reading of this Bill, when the ballots are returned to a close constituency and it is found that the vote of the soldiers changes the result in that constituency, ill-feeling will be engendered. It is because of this probability that I am strongly opposed to this Bill. There is no safeguard; we simply say that because a man is wearing the King's uniform he will be more honest than he would be if he were at home. In elections at home all precautions are taken; we have scrutineers; we have agents; every safeguard surrounds the casting of the vote before a deputy returning officer, who is just as honest as if he were in uniform. I see no reason why similar safeguards should not surround the voting of the soldiers. It is proposed, however, to place the matter in the hands of men who are in a position to suit themselves as to their actions, without the restrictions of any safeguards whatever.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister taken into consideration the advisability of placing the ballot within the affidavit itself, so that there shall be only one document?

Mr. DOHERTY: We cannot very well have the ballot and the affidavit in one document, but as it is now proposed, the affidavit will be endorsed upon the envelope which contains the ballot.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: So far as the first clause of section 2 is concerned, I have no objection. The ballots are simply sent to the High Commissioner in London, and to the commander of the forces in Bermuda. I presume that the provisions of the law as it exists to-day will be observed, so far as they can be observed, under this Bill, and that there is a disposition to that effect.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is a provision that this Bill is to be read as one with the Dominion Elections Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The difficulty which I see in connection with this Bill has just been expressed by the hon. member for Welland. We cannot disguise the fact that human nature is human nature, whether the person concerned be clad in khaki or in mufti. I wish to call attention to subsection 3 of this section, as follows:

> The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall also notify by telegraph cable the secretary of the High Commissioner for Canada, and the secretary shall thereupon send a sufficient number of ballot papers and envelopes to the chief paymaster of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, who shall forward the same to the several regimental paymasters, and such paymasters shall deliver the same to the officers commanding squadrons, companies and batteries, and such officers shall give each volunteer under their respective commands making the affidavit in form B before such officer, a ballot paper.

These ballots are sent from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the Secretary of the High Commissioner in London; they are transmitted by him to the paymaster of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, who, in turn, sends them to the officers commanding squadrons, companies and batteries. Why should they be sent through so many hands? They should be sent to one person, the person who is to act as returning officer. The other day my hon. friend referred to the fifteen states of the union which had passed laws providing for voting of soldiers in the field. I have not been able to get all information on this subject, but I have found this much: that polling was carried on among the soldiers much the same as it was carried on elsewhere. A polling booth was kept, scrutineers were appointed and the casting of ballots was subject to very much the same regulations as applied to the voting elsewhere. It would be much more difficult to have the same thing apply to the operation of this proposed legislation, however, because in the United States all the men who were in the field were under the immediate control of the authorities; it is not so in this case. What I would suggest would be a commission to take the votes, so that they would be under constant supervision, and so that the same rules should apply in the taking of these votes as apply in the case of elections at home. The hon. member for St. John city has prepared an amendment, which I should like the minister to consider.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I had in mind was that three commissioners should be appointed who would have entire charge of the taking of these votes. These commissioners would be appointed in this manner: one upon the nomination of the Prime Minister, and one upon the nomination of the leader of the Opposition; these two commissioners will appoint a third, and if they fail to agree on a third commissioner the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada shall appoint him. These commissioners will make all necessary regulations for the marking of the ballots, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. Perhaps I might read this proposed amendment:

> The Governor in Council shall appoint two commissioners for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, one of whom shall be nominated by the Prime Minister and one by the leader of the Opposition, within—days after the passing hereof. And on failure of either the Prime Minister or the leader of the Opposition to make such nomination, the Governor in Council may make the appointment of the commissioner which either of such parties so failed to nominate. The said commissioners so appointed shall appoint a third commissioner within ten days of their being notified by the Governor in Council of their appointment, and should they fail to agree on such third commissioner, such third commissioner shall on the request of either or both of the said two commissioners be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. In case of the death, resignation or refusal to act at any time of either of such commissioners his place shall be filled in manner hereinbefore prescribed for the appointment of the said commissioner who so died, resigned or refused to act. The majority of the commissioners shall constitute a quorum and their acts shall be as legal and valid as the joint acts of the three commissioners.
>
> The said commissioners shall have power, and it shall be their duty from time to time, to make all necessary regulations for the taking of the votes, the marking of the ballots, the taking of the affidavits of the voters and the transmission thereof to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and all procedure in connection therewith, so as to insure as far as possible that all persons entitled to vote hereunder shall have a fair and reasonable opportunity of doing so. Such regulations shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. And when they have been so approved they shall have the same force and effect as if they were enacted as a part of this Act.
>
> The commissioners shall have power to appoint such persons to act as scrutineers and otherwise to assist in carrying out the said regulations as the commissioners may deem necessary from time to time.

My idea is that the commissioners could make these regulations at their leisure, and of course they have to be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. These commissioners would keep control of the

ballots. It seems to me that this would be a very much better method than that provided in the Bill, which allows the ballots to be sent out broadcast to the different paymasters, to be delivered in turn to the commanders of squadrons, companies and batteries. The regulations should provide that the ballots must always be in the charge of the commissioners or their deputies, whom they might appoint from time to time. This seems to me a very much better provision. At all events, I throw out the suggestion for the consideration of my hon. friend.

12 noon.

Mr. DOHERTY: At first glance I should be very apprehensive that the constitution of a civilian body of this kind might be looked upon as an invasion of the field of the military authorities. The plan as outlined in the Bill has proceeded upon the assumption that we were keeping ourselves within our own scope, although I think some hon. gentlemen said that we were going too far in the invasion of the field that ought to be reserved exclusively to the military authorities. Generally speaking, this Bill is to provide for a clear recognition by law of the right of the soldiers to vote, and to provide a method by which that right may be exercised. In the carrying out of that plan we do not propose to send to the military forces any officers of our law such as has been suggested by the hon. gentleman, but to provide the men who are there already in their military capacity with the means by which they themselves can provide the machinery for voting. Now to constitute a commission which will name a large number of officers —and they might select them from the military men, I suppose; I do not know precisely how they would proceed about it—seems to me at the first glance to involve the introduction into the army there of some civilian body which is going to carry on operations. The members of that civilian body, being non-military men, will in no way be under the control, as military men, of the authorities there. I am just pointing this out as what occurred to me at first glance, but I am not saying that it is necessarily impossible to act upon the suggestion of my hon. friend. It might be possible to reduce the number of hands that these ballots will have to pass through. It occurs to me that if provision is made for the ballots being sent at the outset to the chief paymaster instead of to the secretary of the High Commissioner, we would at all vents avoid one transmission. If that were adopted, we would have just these two transmissions: the ballots would be in the possession of the chief paymaster, and would be passed by him to the regimental paymasters, and from them to the company officers. Of course the ballots should be kept carefully and not be distributed indiscriminately. It is not proposed to make any indiscriminate distribution; the ballot is to get to the man who is going to use it only after he has taken the necessary affidavit. The thing that is going to pass through these people's hands is a blank ballot. Now, any person can get printed any number of these blank ballots, so I do not quite see what is the serious danger in having some of these blank ballots in the hands of the officers. Why, I have here half a dozen blank ballots myself.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before they went out would you not have them certified to and given an official character?

Mr. DOHERTY: As I take it, they will acquire their official character by the affidavits on the envelopes in which the ballots will be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Are you not going to make some provision to prevent the indiscriminate printing of ballots? Will there not be something to identify the ballots as offiicial when sent to the secretary of the High Commissioner?

Mr. DOHERTY: In distributing these ballots we shall have all the provisions that are made with regard to the distribution of other ballots. I have half a dozen ballots here, and there is nothing to prevent me from going to a printing office and getting them absolutely reproduced. These ballots become official and acquire a value which makes it necessary to preserve them when once they have been used in connection with an election. I do not quite see that there is a tremendous danger in putting them in the hands of the paymasters, when somebody who is not a paymaster at all can go and get any number printed. Of course, he would have to have them printed on the paper prescribed by the statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They might be stamped by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery before they left his office.

Mr. DOHERTY: That might be done, but it seems to me that the natural effect of that is to give them an official character,

which makes it dangerous if anybody gets possession of them.

Mr. MURPHY: Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is all we get by giving them out with a stamp on them. We make it a dangerous thing, but if the ballot be a ballot pure and simple, its value begins only when it has attached to it that which makes a vote out of it. Its value begins therefore when it has been voted upon and when it is encased in the envelope with the necessary affidavits taken before the proper officer. I quite agree with hon. gentlemen who have spoken. But let us take the other suggestion. Commissioners, we will say, are going to have charge of these ballots. The commissioners will distribute them to I do not know how many scrutineers and deputies. I cannot help but think that there is a greater danger in such a system as that. It has been argued that a man with his uniform on is no better than a man with his uniform off. If it is better to have scrutineers than that the ballots should go through the hands of an officer it is not because they go through the hands of men who do not wear a uniform. I think we may assume that a uniformed man and a man without a uniform are on a footing of equality in that respect.

Mr. NESBITT: The scrutineers are a check on each other; it does not matter whether they are honest or dishonest.

Mr. DOHERTY: We are not discussing what is going to happen when they go to take the vote; we are discussing the comparative safety of ballots going through the hands of people. They have to go through somebody's hands. What is the advantage of these somebodies not being soldiers? There is the disadvantage of introducing a large civilian element in this matter. What did seem to me as the result of the suggestion of my right hon. friend and as the result of the brief conference I had with him, as being a reasonable and useful thing, was that we should appoint a commission whose business it would be to be representative of the respective parties and who will be placed in a position where they could, each as representative of a party, secure in connection with the giving of this vote to each of the parties respectively the protection that is secured under the system here to each of the candidates by the provision which entitles the candidates to have a representative in each of the polling booths. Instead of providing for six commissioners as suggested, and which on reflection I think is an entirely unwieldy and unworkable number, if we provide for the appointment of two commissioners, one on the nomination of the Prime Minister and one on the nomination of the leader of the Opposition, and give them all the powers that are given to scrutineers with the further power of appointing agents who would be entitled to exercise the powers of the commissioners themselves, then we will create a system whereby each of the parties is enabled to secure to itself in connection with the vote the very same protection that the law provides in connection with our voting here by allowing each of the candidates to have a representative who may be present at the different operations that are provided for here and perform the same functions that scrutineers would perform here. Something on this line would seem to me to be as far as we could go and after all it creates a situation where a military officer who is the returning officer will perform his operations in the presence of the representative of each of the parties. One cannot make imperative requirements any more than imperative requirements are made under the law here. Under the law here there is no absolute requirement that the scrutineer shall be present. On the contrary, there is an express provision that the absence of the scrutineer shall not affect the validity of anything. All the law does is to recognize the right of each candidate to provide some one to act as his representative, but the law does not insist upon the presence of that man as being essential to the validity of that which is done. Why need we go farther than the law here goes with the result of providing very cumbersome machinery and creating the possibility of very considerable delay in the taking of the votes?

Mr. TURRIFF: Would it be provided in the Bill that there shall be a fixed day or hour for taking the vote in any particular regiment, so that the scrutineers may be on hand at the proper time and so that there will be no possibility of the vote being taken before or after a certain time?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, the Bill does not make such provision, and I do not think it could do so without creating a situation which will make the taking of the vote impossible or make it imply some encroach-

ment upon the performance of military duty. As I understand the provision of the Bill with reference to the taking of the votes, they will be taken as they can conveniently be taken. The officer commanding the company—and that officer will only have a comparatively small number of ballots, only as many ballots as there are men in the company—shall, under the Act, furnish a ballot to any volunteer who presents himself before him, asks for a ballot for the purpose of voting and makes the affidavit that is required. Thereupon the soldier may mark his ballot, but under the system I have been trying to outline I fancy that in all probability—I do not see how it could work otherwise—these agents that the commissioners would name would be men or officers in the different companies, and, being brother officers and soldiers, I can hardly believe that the officer who was going to take the votes would be endeavouring to run away from the scrutineers or that there would be any attempt on his part to prevent them from exercising the powers conferred upon them. After all, I think they would all get on in the perfectly amicable way in which scrutineers representing different candidates in a polling booth in this country get on together. I think we would be able to take each other's word about arranging one thing and another, and I think we would be justified in doing that in the case of military men. It seems to me that a scheme of that kind might be worked out. I would be glad to act on the suggestion of the hon. member to refer some of these matters to a small committee. However, there are other sections of the Bill which we might go on with in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. NESBITT: If the minister is going to have any portion of this Bill discussed by a small committee it would save a great deal of time if he would let the whole Bill go to that committee.

Mr. DOHERTY: Even after such a committee has performed its duties there are other clauses in the Bill which would have to be taken up by the Committee of the Whole, and we might as well discuss them now. We can reserve for a special committee such matters as this committee thinks call for further consideration.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Is there anything in the Bill to deal with a situation such as this: suppose a shell comes along and destroys a number of these ballots after they have been marked, is there any machinery in the Bill to have the ballots marked again by those who had previously marked them? That is a perfect possibility. The soldiers enjoy their leisure in the trenches in reading their letters and writing their letters, with shells flying over their heads all the time, and I suppose the minister has imagination enough to conceive that the place where the soldiers are enjoying such leisure as men at war have, is a place where a poll might be taken. If you do not take the ballot in such a place, you would have to take the soldiers outside the firing line for the purpose of your election at the front. If a poll were taken there and a bunch of the ballots were marked and a shell destroyed the whole bunch, has the minister any arrangement for dealing with that situation?

Mr. DOHERTY: No. No more is there any arrangement provided by law under the Election Act, for what is to happen if the polling-booth should be struck by lightning and all of the marked ballots destroyed, which is a thing that may happen. I am striving to contend with the practical difficulties which surround the taking of this vote, but I really cannot undertake to overcome the forces of nature in order to prevent all of the things that might happen by reason of the conditions under which this vote is going to be taken. It is a soldiers' vote and it will be taken under war conditions, and just as the soldier himself has to take the risk of what may happen, I am afraid that the soldiers' ballots will have to take the risk of what may happen to them.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Does the Minister of Justice not think that if he were to have a general election in Canada on a day when lightning were likely to be as frequent as shells are on the battle-field, that he would postpone the election from that particular day? I am almost certain he would, especially if he was going to be the returning officer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If the Government will not accept the suggestion made by my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) to have a commission, of course we can go on with the Bill, but if the Government leaves that point undecided, there is no use going on to consider the section, because the idea embodied in the amendment of the hon. member is that the commission should make regulations subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. The Minister of Justice sees no inconvenience in having ballots distributed promiscuously, but

the law as it exists takes precaution against the promiscuous distribution of ballots, and for very good reasons. These restrictions as to the distribution of ballots were inserted in the law, because if an agent wanted to bribe an elector he would give him a ballot previously marked to deposit in the box and get the voter to bring back the original ballot, so as to ensure that the person bribed would deliver the goods. The suggestion of my hon. friend provides that regulations shall be made by this commission. Are we to have a counterfoil on these ballots? Are we to have a poll-book as in the ordinary elections? The Minister of Justice wants to make a commissioned officer the returning officer.

In all probability the officer, if he is an English officer, will be very much embarrassed as to what his duties are. He will have nc conception of them; the work will be something very new to him and he will be a very poor returning officer I am sure; but if we have scrutineers on either side, he then can be instructed as to his duties. If, however, my hon. friend were to agree to the suggestion made by my hon. friend from St. John that we should have a special committee appointed, it would certainly obviate a number of difficulties, and we would have more satisfactory legislation than we would otherwise have.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The suggestion has often been made by hon. gentlemen opposite that it is proposed to distribute ballots promiscuously. I have not heard of any such intention, nor do I find it in the provisions of the Bill. In the ordinary course, the ballots go to the deputy returning officer who is bound to keep them in his possession until he hands them out one by one to the voters who desire to record their votes. In the present case it is proposed to use the military organization for the same purpose, and ballots are to be delivered to the commanding officer of each unit, the smallest unit being selected; that is to say, companies, squadrons and batteries. The commanding officer of any particular company, squadron or battery, does not distribute the ballots indiscriminately; what he does is to hand a ballot to any soldier who comes before him and makes an affidavit showing that under the provisions of this Bill he is qualified to vote. Apart from that the commanding officer has no authority whatever to deliver a ballot to any person at all, just as the deputy returning officer has no authority to deliver a ballot except to a voter whose name is upon the list and who comes into the polling booth and demands the right to exercise his franchise, so that there is no promiscuous distribution of the ballots under the provisions of this Bill. The purpose of this Bill is simply to use, as necessarily one must use, the military organization for the purpose of giving the soldiers at the front or in Great Britain the right to record their votes. In framing the Bill, the committee were inspired with the belief, which I think might very well be supported by hon. members on both sides of the House, that we could not anticipate that men serving their country at the front under conditions which have been described by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) could have their minds taken up with the desire to commit a fraud in the exercise of the franchise under the provisions of this Bill. It is perfectly obvious that if the men at the front are to have the right to exercise the franchise, one must give to the officers who are commanding them and to the men themselves some credit for reasonable honesty and for a desire to carry out the provisions of this Bill as they are intended to be carried out. If we start with the premise that every officer or man at the front is filled with and animated by a desire to commit a fraud in the exercise of his franchise, of course very wide precautions will be necessary; but after all, whatever precautions you take, either in this Bill or in any other Bill concerning the exercise of the franchise, the legitimate carrying out of its provisions depends in the last analysis upon the men selected to carry them out. You may legislate from to-day until the 31st day of December and in the end, whatever provisions you enact and whatever safeguards you provide, the result will depend upon the honesty and the integrity of the men carrying out the provisions of any legislative measure, and I defy this House or any other House to make legislative provisions with regard to the exercise of the franchise which cannot be defeated by dishonest men. Therefore, the whole question seems, in my judgment, to depend upon whether we may with reasonable confidence rely upon the commanders of the units to discharge the duties imposed upon them by this Bill in an honest way and without any desire to commit a fraud. If we are entitled to have that confidence in them, then it seems to me that the Bill contains reasonably sufficient safeguards; if we are not entitled to have that confidence in them, then I believe that no safeguards that we can insert will in the last analysis prevent fraud from being committed. I have not the slightest idea as to the political

opinions of the officers of the various units and I do not know who they are. They were not selected by reason of their political opinions, and I have every confidence that whether they are of one political party or of the other, they will, under the conditions which have been described be disposed to discharge this duty in an honest and patriotic way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The fact that we insist upon taking such precautions as regards military life as are taken in civil life does not imply that there is any discrimination against the members of the army any more than there is discrimination against men in civil life. No one has answered the objection put forward by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) that a uniform does not make a man honest. Whether a man wears a uniform or not, it is human nature all the same, so that we are certainly doing nothing extraordinary in asking that the same precautions which are taken in civil life should be taken as regards military life. Does any one contend that in military life less precaution should be taken than in civil life? Military life is no better than civil life and civil life is no better than military life; human nature is the same in both cases. I am glad to hear from my right hon. friend that there is to be no promiscuous distribution of ballots, and that the volunteer can have the ballot only when he comes and asks for it.

Mr. DOHERTY: He asks for it when he makes the affidavit.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I suppose my right hon. friend has in mind subsection 3 of section 2, part of which reads as follows:

> And such officers shall give each volunteer under their respective commands making the affidavit in form B before such officer, a ballot paper.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is a change from the original Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This is a new provision and it satisfies me. It is a new precaution which has been inserted, showing that the suggestion we have made is not frivolous but serious. All that we can ask under this Bill is that the same precautions should be taken as if the soldiers were voting in Canada.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are perfectly willing to take any precautions except to the extent of making the Bill unworkable. The difference between the right hon. gentleman and myself is this: The basis upon which this Bill was reported by the committee is that under the exceptional conditions in which the soldiers are to exercise their franchise, we must have regard to military considerations, and that the best that we can do is to utilize the military organization for the purpose of giving these men the right to vote. If we superimpose upon that a proposal which will create an organization for the purpose of supervising the exercise by these men of their franchise, of such a character that it cannot be properly worked out under the military regulations which govern at the front, we might as well pass no legislation at all. Subject to that consideration, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is disposed, as I am, to establish every possible safeguard. But I think that is a matter which might very well be considered in the informal committee that has been alluded to. In the meantime, the Minister of Justice thought, and I myself think, that we might make some progress with the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: It would be as impossible for my right hon. friend to prove that all men into whose hands these ballots would fall are honest as it would be unreasonable for any person on this side of the House to argue that all the men into whose hands they may fall are dishonest. That is not the purpose of this discussion. Under the Elections Act as it stands, the Minister of Justice knows perfectly well the principle is to limit the circulation of ballots to as few persons as possible. For that reason, when an election is held in Canada under this Act the ballots are first of all placed in the custody of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. This also is proposed to be done under the Bill now before the committee. When they leave the custody of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery they go to certain designated officers, the returning officers for the several constituencies in Canada. All these officers are under the jurisdiction of the law of Canada and subject to well-understood penalties if they fail to carry out their duties. Here you begin to have a departure under this proposed Act. These men in Canada distribute the ballots to certain deputy returning officers.

Mr. DOHERTY: They have to go into the hands of printers in every constituency in the Dominion.

Mr. MURPHY: I am assuming this is to be done by those who are recognized under our Act as persons responsible for the custody and proper distribution of ballots when the election is held in Canada. Now, the difference between this and the method proposed in the Bill is very marked. The ballots go to other hands and ultimately fall into the custody of people who cannot be designated and are absolutely unknown. This discussion thus far has proceeded on the assumption that all the officers into whose hands these ballots will go are Canadians. I do not so understand the matter. From the discussion which took place the other day, and from the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), possibly repeated by some other gentlemen, I understand that the Canadian troops are dispersed through many regiments and may be under the command of British officers—I mean officers from England, Ireland, Scotland or Wales. They may be under the command of Australian, New Zealand or other officers for aught I know. I venture to say that these officers, if they come from any other country than Canada would be very apt to decline to be bothered with carrying out the details of an election in the face of the tremendous task in which they are engaged. I think that if a request of this kind were made of these officers they would say they were there for carrying on the business of war for the Empire and not for the purpose of carrying on the business of elections for the people of Canada. These seem to me, at any rate, to be practical objections to what has been proposed. Dealing more particularly with the subsection to which the right hon. leader of the Opposition called attention, I would suggest that if that subsection is to be proceeded with, the distribution of the ballots should be entrusted to the several regimental paymasters, and that they should not be further distributed after coming to the hands of these officers.

Mr. DOHERTY: In this country, no doubt, we try to take care of the ballots. Before I go into that, I concede—it was conceded from the outset—that if the view be taken that the soldier cannot vote unless we can have identically and absolutely the precautions taken under the Dominion Elections Act, of course, we shall have to drop the Bill. But it seemed to us that something must be conceded in order to make it possible for the soldier to vote, and it is just because we cannot have him vote under all the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act that it is necessary to pass this Bill. Let us contrast how the ballots are handled in this country with the way they are going to be handled under this Bill. The ballots here are in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and from him they go to the returning officers all over the country. Then they go into the hands of printers in every constituency in this Dominion. When they come back from the printers they go into the hands of deputy-returning officers, of whom there would be in each constituency, on the average, I suppose, fifty or sixty. Now, contrast this with what will happen under this Bill. From the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery these ballots will go to the chief paymaster and from him to the several regimental paymasters. That will not be more men than, I doubt that it will be as many as, there are returning officers in Canada. From these the ballots go to the company or battery commanders, each of whom, as I understand it, commands approximately 250 men. But we here have a returning officer for an average of between 200 and 300 votes. So that, proportionately to the number of voters, we are not exceeding the number of deputy-returning officers in the handling of these ballots. This means that these ballots will go through fewer hands than we are willing that they should go through in dealing with a similar number of voters in Canada. It is conceivable, of course, that some of these people may not be honest; it is conceivable—and I am afraid that we have had evidence of it—that all the men who handle ballots in Canada are not trustworthy under all circumstances. They are human, as has been said, and we have to take them as they are. The question comes back to this: Is it of sufficient importance that we should secure to the soldiers the right to vote to justify our modifying our law in some respects and foregoing to some extent the protection that we seek in the holding of an election in time of peace at home. It does seem to me that it is worth while to make some sacrifice. However we do want to reduce that sacrifice so long as the Act can be made workable. So far, I think, I have accepted every suggestion that has been made—certainly every one that seemed to me at all practicable—looking to greater security. The last one that has been made, it seems to me, cannot be given effect to and at the same time give effect to the soldier's right to vote.

I do not think that the Bill is in any sense open to the reproach that it provides for a more promiscuous scattering of ballots than takes place under the Dominion Elections Act. Indeed, I think that neither under the Dominion Elections Act nor under this Bill can it be said that there is or will be any promiscuous distribution of ballots. The soldier does not get a ballot until he takes the affidavit. While I am willing to give credit to other hon. gentlemen for a number of suggestions which they have made, I must say that that particular improvement is the result of my own consideration of how it might work if you handed the ballot out otherwise than to the man who is going to vote. When he gets the ballot, he does not go away with it; he then and there marks his ballot and returns it. The provision is that the officer must be in such a position that he can see that the voter marks the ballot which he receives, and returns it; so that I think we have done what is humanly possible to be done in that regard. As I say, I am quite willing to consider further whether we can so arrange that it may be possible to provide people who shall have authority to be present, wherever it is practicable for them to be present, to keep an eye on the carrying out of these provisions.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend will know, from his experience as the able and courteous chairman of the committee which drafted this Bill, how much faster progress can be made when discussing matters informally in committee than can possibly be made in a committee such as this, even taking it for granted that there is a general desire to make headway. In connection with the observations which my hon. friend has just made, this distinction should be pointed out: for any irregularity which may be committed in Canada, a remedy is provided by law, but for any irregularity which may be committed elsewhere, there is no remedy. Irregularities, I believe, occur through ignorance or carelessness just as frequently, possibly, as they do through deliberate intent. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that all the ballots, before being sent away, should bear the stamp of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery?

Mr. DOHERTY: Inasmuch as the Bill which we are now passing is to be read as one with the Dominion Elections Act, such provisions as now exist with regard to what shall be stamped on the ballots will apply to the operation of this proposed legislation. I take it, therefore, that the ballot mentioned in this Bill is the ballot described in the Dominion Elections Act. As to the suggestion that this could be better dealt with in a small committee, I have already said that I think subsection 4 ought to stand to be dealt with by the sub-committee. If that meets with the view of the committee, I suggest that subsection 4 be allowed to stand for that purpose, and that we proceed to the consideration of other clauses which will not, I think, not give rise to any questions necessitating such action.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: I think that the suggestion that a small committee be appointed is a good one. I think the suggestion made by the Minister of Justice should be acted upon, namely, that the opinions of hon. gentlemen be taken down so that the committee will have the benefit of their views with regard to these different sections. I understood the Minister of Justice to say that section 4 only should be referred to a committee.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is as far as we have gone. If there are any suggestions with regard to matters contained in previous sections, I should be glad to hear them.

Mr. McLEAN: I think that in sections 2 and 3 there are some matters that may require consideration by such a committee. We have arrived at the position where both parties are practically united on the principle of this Bill; both parties are united in their support of giving the soldiers an opportunity to vote. We now come to consider the method by which that shall be done, and it seems to me that the machinery whereby the soldiers will be given an opportunity to vote should be made as direct and as simple as possible. Surely it ought not to be difficult to give these men an opportunity to register their votes before proper officers. We cannot apply to their voting the whole election machinery used in civil life, but we can rely on the assumption that officers commanding these regiments, companies and units will honestly carry out the duties imposed upon them. Officers who are in command of a certain number of men and who have other officers under them, realizing the necessity of their possessing the respect and confidence of the men over whom they have control, would surely do nothing which would cause the men to lose that confidence in them. It seems to me to be proper that the ballots should be given to the chief paymaster, because he has direct communication with every officer and with all men in the expeditionary force. I think

it is advisable that a change be made in the section whereby it will be provided that the officer taking the ballots shall make a list of the men who have voted, such list to be returned in the envelope with the ballots. It would be very easy for the officer, as the soldier votes, to put down his name and the number opposite his name, and to put that number on the envelope containing the soldier's affidavit. The ballot, of course, will be in a separate envelope. I would point out also that this section says that the ballots shall be delivered by the paymaster to the officers commanding squadrons, companies, and batteries, who shall deliver them to the soldiers under their command. Sometimes, in the absence of the commanding officer, the next senior officer takes command, and I suggest that in order to cover this point, it might be provided that the ballot be delivered by the paymaster to the officer commanding, or, in his absence, to the senior officer in charge.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think it is section 3 that provides that, if for any reason the officer charged with such duty is unable to perform it, it shall be performed by the officer next below him in rank.

Mr. McLEAN: I had not noticed that. I see that it is provided that the paymasters shall deliver the ballot papers to the officers commanding squadrons, companies and batteries. Now, the medical officers are neither a battery, a company nor a squadron; and to cover them I think we ought to insert the words "and units" after "companies and batteries." If we provided that the ballots should be distributed also by the officers commanding medical units, we should cover the men in our hospitals, which are in charge of officers with the honorary rank of colonel. I think we ought to make the officers commanding absolutely responsible for having these ballots sent forward, marked and collected.

At one o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: There are one or two more suggestions that I would like to call to the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice. Looking over paragraph 3 of section 2 I find there is a very good provision made in regard to the channel that may be used in forwarding the ballots. It is provided that the paymasters' department shall distribute the ballots. It seems to me that the same channel should be used in collecting the ballots from the officers commanding the different units in different places so that there will be no delay in having these packages collected and returned. Another point is that there ought to be a limit to the time at which the polling is to take place. Before recess I pointed out that an officer commanding a company might have 220 men under him, that an officer commanding a battery might have 240 men under him, that these officers are therefore very busy men, especially when on active service and very important duties devolve upon them. It is quite right that the ballots should be sent to the commanding officer but he should have authority to authorize or employ other officers under him to carry out the duties prescribed in the Act. There are always one or two officers in the orderly room who might be available for doing this particular work and he might appoint the assistant adjutant, or some other officer under his command, to carry out these duties. It is going to take a long time to receive 220 affidavits and it is imposible for the commanding officer to do it himself. It should be provided that in the event of the officer commanding not being able to act himself the next senior should act. It would be better to authorize the commanding officer to appoint some other officer to carry out this duty if necessary. In the ordinary way, when an officer commanding is required to do so and so it does not mean that he himself, personally, does it. I have no doubt that in this discussion efforts are being made by hon. members to make the Bill perfect, and I think we should be able to provide machinery direct and simple in character to carry out the wishes of the House. In regard to the suggestion made by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), that it might be advisable to have a commission of two, one representing the Government and one representing the Opposition, I would not go so far as my hon. friend because I would not like this commission to interfere with the disposition of the ballots through the channel which has been decided upon, that of the paymaster. I could see the advisability of having a commission whose duty it is to see that the work is carried out properly, that is to have general supervision over it. Explanations and information might be required by the officers charged with this duty, and it would be necessary for them to write to some one. Whom would they

write to? If they were a little slow in taking in their instructions they would not know whom to apply to. A commissioner on the spot could give all the necessary directions.

Mr. DOHERTY: The suggestions made by my hon. friend are worthy of very careful consideration. I understand that the hon. member first points out that if we distribute these ballots to the officers commanding squadrons, companies and batteries, that might leave unprovided for some other bodies that would not come within the description. Of course we want to cover everybody as far as we possibly can do it. I have had some consultation with my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence as to what might be added to meet that desire and he thinks we would reach everybody if we added to the words "squadrons, companies and batteries," the words, "or of any line of communication or administrative unit." I understand that would cover hospitals and men engaged otherwise. I also understand that the word "unit" might extend to a much larger body of men than a company or squadron. What we had in mind was to endeavour to reach the officer who would have a reasonable number of people under his command. If that addition would meet the view of my hon. friend I would be quite happy to amend the Bill to that extent. As to the officer keeping a list, no doubt it would make the matter more perfect, but I think we ought to bear in mind the conditions that will exist when this vote is being taken and we have to be a little on our guard not to impose so many detailed operations on the officer as to make it impossible for him to carry out the directions. The advantages of a list no doubt are considerable, but on the other hand when all the votes of the company are to be deposited in a bag or other receptacle and forwarded, bearing on the outside the affidavit of the man who gives the vote, it will be a very simple procedure. We have provided that these envelopes shall be returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and he has to keep a record of them. Whether there would be sufficient gained from that list to compensate for the additional duty imposed on the officer appears to me to be perhaps open to question.

As to the return of the ballots through the same channel as that through which they are sent, a good deal of consideration has been given to that idea. The consideration that led us to the conclusion that it would be better that they should be posted direct after the voting by the officer who took them was that it is objectionable that the ballots should pass through too many hands, and whatever force there might be in the objection when you are dealing with an unmarked ballot becomes greater when you are dealing with a ballot that has been actually marked. It seemed to us that it would be wiser that the ballots should pass as directly as possible from the officer who took the vote to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Ultimately they will have to get into the post office, and it did seem to us that the earlier they got into the post office the better. In reference to what the hon. member has said as to the officers commanding these companies, squadrons and batteries, appointing others to do the work, you see there again that you are increasing the number of people who are going to handle these ballots. After all, at home we give to one deputy returning officer complete control of the voting of between 200 and 300 voters, and all the operations, as far as possible, have to take place between eight in the morning and five in the afternoon.

On the other hand, under the system provided, the votes may be taken at the time that is most convenient, and the Bill does not propose, nor do I think it desirable or possible, to fix that this shall be done on a particular day or at a particular time. It ought to be reasonably possible for the officers to take the vote of those who desire to vote. I have with my colleagues given the best consideration possible to the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John and my view is confirmed that an endeavour to create machinery such as he suggested would in all probability, result in making the plan unworkable. I feel impelled to say that I do not find it possible to accept that suggestion. If something in the nature of what I endeavoured to outline, namely, the making of it possible for scrutineers to be authorized to be present, I would be disposed to acquiesce in the wisdom of letting that be considered by a small committee, such as has been suggested.

Mr. GERMAN: Suppose a number of these ballots have been marked and received in due course by the returning officer, and it is evident that those who have made affidavits are not on the voters' list for a particular district, nor were they residents of that locality at the time they enlisted, will these votes be counted, and would the defeated candidate have to resort to a protest and recount in order to strike them out?

Mr. DOHERTY: I take it that such ballots would be in the same position as any other ballots that have been cast at an election, and I do not see that we can make a provision whereby the returning officer could adjudge whether the affidavits upon which these men had been allowed to vote were true or false. An analogous situation would arise if at the counting of the ballots in an ordinary election it were established that fifty men had voted who were not qualified. In an election held at home there would be no right in the returning officer to strike these names off, and I do not see that we could provide here for a system under which with regard to the absent soldier a trial could be had then and there and a determination reached as to whether he told the truth in the affidavit he made. After all, what would occur in this case is what would occur in an ordinary election held at home.

Mr. GERMAN: In the ordinary case, a man's name is on the list or he could not vote; but I venture to say that there will not be 20,000 men, out of the 100,000 men on active service, whose names will be on any voters' list. You can have the man in Canada arrested for perjury at once, but under the provisions of this Bill a man may make any affidavit he likes and he is immune of the law.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: These men enlisted in September or October, and at that time the courts were proceeding to revise the lists for 1914. I can well recollect that at many places the objection was raised that the men were not there at the time, and the judge very properly said that the men were at home when the application was made and that the fact that they went to Valcartier only temporarily disarranged their residence, so that he allowed their names on the list. The hon. gentleman is very wide of the mark when he says that not 20,000 out of the 100,000 soldiers would be found on the lists of last year.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to protest against the statement of the minister that there was some suggestion on our side that the commanding officer at Bermuda was not a person to be trusted. That is not the question before us. The question is: Is he the proper person to be charged with this responsibility? In the following section, my hon. friend, in dealing with the votes in other parts of the world, says that he is not the proper person, and I see no reason why the commanding officer at Bermuda should have a responsibility laid upon him that is not to be laid upon commanding officers elsewhere. My hon. friend says that the chief paymaster cannot be as conveniently employed for Bermuda as he can for the European situation. It is not necessary that the chief paymaster shall be employed; there is a paymaster for the forces at Bermuda, I presume, and if my hon. friend will make the paymaster at Bermuda the recipient of the ballots, he will have the section in that particular on all fours with the other proviso.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not see that it makes the slightest difference, if there is a regimental paymaster at Bermuda, whether the ballot goes to the commanding officer or to the paymaster. So far as we are concerned, the matter is not worth while discussing.

Mr. OLIVER: Let me disagree, then, with the right hon. the Prime Minister, because I think the matter is worth while discussing.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I said, "So far as we are concerned." I was not speaking for the hon. member.

Mr. DOHERTY: If my hon. friend wants to be quite certain that at all times there will be a paymaster at Bermuda, I can, of course, delay the Bill in order to ascertain this point. The hon. gentleman seems to think that it is important whether the commanding officer or the paymaster receives the ballots. If that is the case, I will try to find out whether or not there is a paymaster at Bermuda; but there will always be a commanding officer—that is the one advantage that we have. I am not in a position to say with any certainty that there will always be a paymaster actually available. The commanding officer is a general term; no matter if the man who generally commands is absent, there will always be a man commanding, and we have a certainty that we shall have an official person who will always be available.

That is the only reason for the difference. In the other case, the reason why we fell upon the paymaster was that by taking the general paymaster for the entire force, we got a man who had a regular system of communication with the entire expeditionary force. It was not because he happened to be paymaster that he seemed to be desirable; it was simply because he was the man who had the entire organization ready to carry out the work. This argument would not apply to the paymas-

ter at Bermuda who would be purely a regimental paymaster, just like any other officer of the regiment.

Mr. OLIVER: There were reasons put forward by the hon. member for Sunbury and Queens (Mr. H. H. McLean) why the commanding officer should not be used. These reasons apply just as much to the men in Bermuda as they do to any other place, and I am only suggesting that the section be amended to make the terms correspond in effect with the like provisions elsewhere in the Legislation. As to whether the matter is important or not, it has been suggested that there are less than 1,000 men in Bermuda, and if those 1,000 men are entitled to vote in the province of Nova Scotia, I do not think I need impress upon the House that those are enough votes, if properly directed, to change the electoral complexion of that province. I have seen tremendous issues decided by a less number of votes than that; I have seen elections carried by the vote of the deputy returning officer, and important issues resulting from that condition. It is not for this House to consider lightly the question whether votes shall be properly counted or not; for be it remembered that this is not a question of the right of the men to cast their votes—no one disputes their right—but whether those votes are going to be cast under proper conditions and with the guarantee that, having been cast under proper conditions, they shall be properly counted. It is desirable that the individual citizen shall have the right to vote whether he is a soldier or not, but it is essential to the welfare of the state that the result of the voting shall be the fair expression of the mind of the people according to the well-understood and well-defined rules laid down and worked upon before and during the election. The proposal of this Bill is that a certain separate condition shall be established that there shall be votes cast under different conditions from those under which the rest of the votes shall be cast. A new feature is projected into our elections, and the minister says: You must not accuse us of improper motives in connection with the projection of this new system of voting and of counting votes. We have to take things as we find them and if it is possible to switch the whole of the elections in Canada by the manipulation of the votes cast by the men overseas,—and I maintain it is—then I maintain further that this Government has no right nor claim to be released from the suspicion that it has within its ranks the men who will be willing to do that. For the sake of the credit of the Government let us have such provisions in this Bill as shall remove the Government from suspicion. If the minister cannot provide such provisions then he has no right to ask that this Parliament shall place in the hands of himself and his colleagues the power of counting their opponents in or out of office as they please to manipulate those votes.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have said all that I can usefully say with regard to the line of argument in which the hon. member sees proper to persist. Therefore I trust he will not think me discourteous if I do not say anything further.

Mr. MACDONALD: In regard to the taking of the votes at Bermuda, I hope the Government will see its way clear to have a committee appointed to look into the matter of carrying out the details of this Bill along the line of the suggestion made by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). The sole question is as to the best machinery by which those votes can be polled, and it is a matter which can be very much better settled, in the light of all the discussion we have had, by a small number of members than by the Committee of the Whole. Bermuda is a West Indian island, a British possession, in fairly close proximity to Canada, and a great many people speak about the desirability of having it in Canada. Almost all the votes that will be polled by the Canadian regiment at Bermuda will be polled in the constituency of Halifax, which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister represents. I see no reason why, as Bermuda is within two days' sail of Canada and there are absolutely peace conditions there, there should not be a method of voting provided for Bermuda in all respects the same as the method used in Canada. This regiment in Bermuda, although it is for the time being doing imperial service, is the Royal Canadian Regiment, under Canadian control to a degree different from what it would be if it were in Great Britain or in the fighting line. Now, the casting of a vote in the method proposed under clause 2 is an abnormal method which is being improvised by the Government to meet difficulties that arise in the life of the soldiers on active service. These conditions do not apply in Bermuda. Many of these men have voted in Halifax in previous elections, and they are accus-

tomed to vote; and it does seem to me there is no reason why the Government should not appoint a returning officer to go to Bermuda and poll the votes of these men after the manner provided for other soldiers in the later portions of the Bill. I can see reason for providing unusual and peculiar facilities for the men on the firing line; but the same conditions do not apply in Bermuda. It is true that Bermuda is under another jurisdiction, but there would be no objection to a Canadian returning officer and scrutineers going to Bermuda, an adjacent and friendly colony, and performing their duties in regard to the votes of men comprising a purely Canadian regiment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken as to the personnel of these men in Bermuda. This regiment is recruited in part from the permanent force in Halifax, but it is also recruited, in considerable part, if I am not mistaken, from Valcartier camp.

Mr. LANCASTER: Several there are from Ontario.

Mr. MACDONALD: That does not affect the principle.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would interfere to this extent: If you undertook to establish polls you would have to establish the polls for many different constituencies. I think about 400 of these men are from a force assembled at Valcartier and gathered from all over the Dominion. Therefore the conditions do not seem to be such as to make it practicable for the vote to be taken in the ordinary way.

Mr. MACDONALD: The answer of my right hon. friend does not furnish any reason why my suggestion should not be carried out under clause 5 of the Bill. If the men in Bermuda were in large degree recruited from Valcartier, the regiment would still be in the same position as one mobilized anywhere in Canada. There is no reason why the system applied to volunteers here in Canada should not be worked in the case of volunteers in Bermuda.

Mr. DOHERTY: It might possibly be worked out in Bermuda, but it does involve some anomalies arising out of our issuing a writ to an officer to go beyond the limits of Canada to perform the duties of a returning officer. We should have no more authority over his proceedings outside of Canada than we have over those of these other officers concerned. If it be true—I do not discuss it—that we cannot punish the people for offences committed in France, we cannot deal more effectually with those who have committed offences in Bermuda. When we came to the actual making of distnctions under this Bill, we found a natural line of difference running between that class of soldiers who are within Canada and that class of soldiers who are outside of Canada. That indicates one system for one class and a different system for the other. Those in Bermuda may be under different conditions from those in other places outside of Canada in relation to this Bill, but they are more like the soldiers outside of Canada than like the soldiers inside Canada. It is to be remembered that all our soldiers outside of Canada are not, and will not be at the time of an election should one be held, in the field of active hostilities. We have soldiers in England for long periods at a time, and it may happen that many will be in England at the time of an election, should one take place. If this system can be adopted for soldiers generally outside of Canada, I fail to see what advantage there would be in distinguishing between those who happen to be in Bermuda or in England and those who happen to be in countries nearer to or actually within the scene of war. We must draw the line somewhere, and it seems to me we have drawn it at the proper place. Further than that, the practical difficulties of carrying out Canadian law in Bermuda with regard to the prepartion of ballots and so on, it seems to me, would be considerable, and we might get ourselves into complications that would be hardly desirable and run risks otherwise unnecessary for the sake of making a separate arrangement with regard to one regiment of soldiers amongst all those outside of Canada.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Another consideration I mentioned a moment ago. The regiment at Bermuda is anxious to go to the front, and may go to the front. It is not improbable that they may be sent before an election is held, if it should be held. Therefore, we might have a force in Bermuda made up of men gathered from all over Canada, in which case the observations of my hon friend from Pictou would not apply.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Bill provides that the ballots shall be separate from the affidavits. I think it is worthy of considera

tion whether the affidavit and the ballot should not form one document—one paper. Let the ballot paper be quite large, and the blank form of affidavit be printed on the back. In that way we should be sure that the ballot paper marked by the voter himself was the one accompanying the affidavit.

Mr. DOHERTY: Then, how are you going to preserve the secrecy of the ballot if we act on the hon. gentleman's suggestion, the man's name will appear in the affidavit on the back of the ballot?

Mr. PUSGLEY: My hon. friend knows that a distinct law, different entirely from the law that governs the taking of the vote in Canada is being provided. It is very important I think that there should be no switching of the ballot, no separation of the ballot from the affidavit of the man who has marked the ballot. The hon. gentleman has stated that we must trust those who have charge of the ballots. I am inclined to think that the commanding officers will not like to be bothered very much in connection with the taking of these votes, and that they will be very glad to avail themselves of the services of any Canadian commissioned officers who may be present to assist in the taking of this vote. If you have the ballot entirely apart from the affidavit, there is nothing in the world to prevent anybody who may be so minded from marking a ballot in a different way from that in which the soldier marked his, and substituting it for the one which the soldier actually marked. It does seem to me that we ought to provide a safeguard against that. If we are going to give the soldiers the right to vote in this peculiar way, we want to be assured, not merely that the soldier shall make an affidavit and mark his ballot, but that the ballot which he does mark will eventually find its way into the box of the returning officer. My hon. friend says that it is our duty to allow those who have gone to the front the right to exercise their franchise. But we owe a duty also to the people of this country, and it is that the expression of their will, as shown by the ballots which they cast, shall not be defeated by the use of ballots which were not marked by the soldiers. These fraudulent ballots, although not marked by the soldiers, will be counted when they reach the box of the returning officer. If you provide that the affidavit shall be on the back of the ballot, you add another safeguard against the switching of ballots and the substitution of fraudulent ballots for genuine ones. It does seem to me that that would be a proper provision to make. My hon. friend says that we ought not to be suspicious, because if men are honest they will not do the thing which we suspect may possibly be done. We do know, however, from our past experience in connection with elections in Canada, that men who in their ordinary business relations are regarded as men of honour and integrity, do things in connection with the carrying on of elections which they would not do in connection with their own business. There are many Canadian politicians at the front, and officers will be just as good politicians at the front as they were at home. I venture to say that there have been no more active partisans in Canada than very many of the officers who are now serving in the Canadian expeditionary force. They are none the worse for that, but we should remove as far as possible any opportunities for wrong-doing in connection with the marking of the ballots. By this section it is provided that the soldier makes the affidavit and puts his ballot in an envelope, on the back of which the affidavit is endorced. He hands that to the officer; the officer then takes charge of it, and the moment the soldier puts his ballot in the envelope and hands it to the officer, any control which he had over it is gone, and there is nothing to prevent the marking another ballot in a different way from that in which the soldier marked his, and the substitution of it for the ballot so bona fide marked by the soldier. I suggest to my hon. friend that the possibility of that condition arising ought not to be permitted. I regret very much that the minister has not seen fit to accept the suggestion for the appointment of an independent and non-partisan commission to take charge of the whole operation of the voting of the soldiers, and to make regulations which might be found necessary from time to time. These regulations would only become operative when approved by the Governor in Council. I feel quite sure that if that method were adopted it would prove satisfactory, and that the people would be assured that the ballots counted represented the true expression of the opinion of our boys at the front. The amendment which I suggested provided that one commissioner should be appointed upon the nomination of the Prime Minister, the other upon the nomination of the leader of the Opposition. The Governor in Council would act upon those nominations, and if either of these gentlemen should decline to nominate, the Governor in

Council might make the appointments. In order to prevent any difficulty that might arise by reason of differences of opinion, my amendment suggested that the persons named should nominate a third commissioner, and that if they should not agree upon a third commissioner within the short period of ten days, that third commissioner should be appointed by the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. I do not know whether or not I suggested it in my amendment, but I would have them sworn properly to discharge their duties, so that we would have an independent, sworn tribunal to make regulations, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. They could appoint their deputies, scrutineers and assistants, and I believe that the scheme would be worked out in a satisfactory manner, and would result in all persons who desired to vote and who were entitled to do so being given a fair and reasonable opportunity to cast their ballots. The minister makes the suggestion that in some way this would seem like intruding officials into the military system of the Empire. Surely that would be no greater intrusion than the passing of an act which makes it the duty of the commanding officer to take charge of and distribute these ballots to the voters; to take the affidavits of the voters; to see that the ballots are marked and put into envelopes and that the envelopes are then sent in a package to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. If one is open to that objection, the other is open to the same objection. It seems to me, therefore, that the argument which my hon. friend makes against the commission on that ground is untenable. But there is another amendment which I think might very well be adopted in connection either with the mode of procedure suggested by my amendment, or with the method suggested by the Bill. and that is, that before taking proceedings under the Statute the consent of the Secretary for War should be obtained. I think that as a matter of courtesy and to ensure the harmonious working out of the details of the Bill that would be a most desirable provision to insert. I can see no possible objection to such a provision, and I think it would be much better to do that than for this Parliament to impose certain duties upon British or Canadian officers, whoever it may be—and now they are all members of the British Army, and under control of the British War Office. The Secretary for War would then know that in the opinion of this Parliament it was considered desirable to give the Canadians who are fighting at the front the opportunity of exercising their franchise, but that at the same time this Parliament recognized that these soldiers and officers were all now a part of the British Army and under the control of the British War Office, and that before taking proceedings which might by any possibility interfere with the morale or the discipline of the army the Bill should be submitted to him, and his approval obtained. So far as the Secretary for War is concerned, that would remove every possible objection against the procedure which is provided for in the Bill, or against that which is proposed in my amendment. I am sure that upon consideration the Minister of Justice will consider it desirable to make an amendment of that kind, whether he adopts the provision contained in my proposed amendment or not.

Just one word as to the certificates. I see that my hon. friend has left certificate C in the same form in which it was when the Bill was before us on a previous occasion. I suppose that is because he is providing that the affidavit shall be on the back of the envelope, by which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will be able to tell to what electoral district the voter is alleged to belong. But that eliminates altogether any inquiry by the person making the affidavit as to whether the man is really a resident and entitled to vote as he alleges. The only thing the officer has to certify to is the name of the man, and the rank and name of the corps in which he is serving. He is not compelled to make an inquiry—

Mr. DOHERTY: Has the hon. gentleman read the whole affidavit?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am not sure that I have. By reason of the kaleidoscopic changes that have been made in the Bill from time to time, almost from
4 p.m. hour to hour, it is impossible for one to be absolutely sure that he has read every line of it. To what does my hon. friend refer?

Mr. DOHERTY: Certificate C provides that the officer shall certify that "according to the best information at my disposal I believe that the statements made in the affidavits are true;" and one of the statements in the affidavit is the statement as to the man's place of residence and his qualifications. The objection taken the

other day was that the affidavit was not put on the back of the envelope, and I was quite willing to recognize the force of that. This certificate has not been changed in the kaleidoscopic changes that have taken place in this Bill, as the hon. member says. This is just as it was. It is simply completed by the fact that the affidavit is on the outside. As to the changes that have been made in the Bill, they have been made because, as I said at the outset, I wanted to avail myself of every suggestion that it was possible to meet; and it does not strike me as the most courteous way of recognizing one's efforts in that direction to have these more or less sneering references to the fact that this Bill has been changed, especially as it has been changed only by virtue of an earnest desire to meet every suggestion that could from any point of view be looked upon as reasonable.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think I was sneering at the efforts of my hon. friend. I was simply stating facts. By the changes he has made my hon. friend admits that the Bill when first brought down was very objectionable indeed. My hon. friend yesterday afternoon had a Bill distributed which contained certain changes. I looked that over. Then this morning another printed Bill was distributed, eliminating the changes that had been made in the previous printed Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: One change.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And a most important one. Therefore, I think I am fairly correct in describing as kaleidoscopic the many changes that have taken place in so short a time.

Mr. DOHERTY: I accept the explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend claims great credit for showing a sincere desire to meet our views. Is it not rather that he is showing a desire to get a perfect Bill? Certainly he should not be willing to have a bad Bill simply for fear he might meet our views. All that we are trying to do is to make suggestions for remedying the striking defects in the Bill as originally presented to the House. Some of us believe that the whole thing is wrong. But I believe that the majority of us on this side of the House, probably all of us, would like to see the Bill go through if it were possible to give the soldiers votes in any reasonable manner. Speaking for myself, I am anxious to have the Bill go through provided the proper safeguards can be thrown around the voting; but we should remember that it is proposed to give votes to men whose only qualification is that they shall have resided thirty days in this country. In the case of ordinary elections most of the provinces require the voter to have resided in this country for a period of at least twelve months. We should be careful to see that the expressed will of the people of Canada who are compelled to vote under the present law, and subject to all the safeguards which surround the voting, is not defeated by bogus ballots which may be put in, or by ballots marked by people at the front who have no right to vote. Unless proper safeguards are provided, the ballots which come back may not be the genuine ballots of the soldiers who marked them, and consequently would not express the real view of the soldiers at the front.

I think my hon. friend has met my objection as to the form of the certificate; although it does seem to me that to make that certificate of any value it ought to be expressly provided in the statute that it shall be the duty of the person taking the affidavit to make inquiry and satisfy himself that the statements contained in the affidavit are true. But the statute seems to be entirely silent as to that, and considering all that the officers at the front are required to do, one can very well understand that they might easily sign the certificate without realizing that they were expected to satisfy themselves as to the truth or otherwise of the statements made in the affidavit.

Mr. NESBITT: The minister stated that a soldier had to ask for the ballot. I find in line 7 of para. 2 of sec. 2 that the commanding officer

—shall provide with a ballot paper and envelope each volunteer under respective commands entitled to vote and who makes the affidavit in form B before such officer.

There is nothing in that to say that the soldier shall have to ask for a ballot to entitle him to vote. I confess that after listening to this debate for a day or two I cannot see what objection the Government would have to the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). All we ask is that this vote be absolutely fair as between the two parties. I see no reason why the Government should refuse to make it fair. It struck me that if there were two commissioners appointed, who might have these officers as their subs, or whatever you might call them, and whose duty it

would be to see that the vote was properly and systematically carried out, it would be possible to take a fair vote. One of these commissioners could be appointed by each party, and that would do away with the ill-feeling and protests that are bound to arise under this Bill. It is all right to talk about the officers being perfectly honest. It is all right to say that to-day, but if to-morrow it does not suit my hon. friends opposite they will say the opposite.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: What do you say?

Mr. NESBITT: As far as I am concerned, the officers are reasonably honest, just the same as the rest of us, but no more so and no less so. When it comes to election time we know that there are a great many people who, while they will not do business in a dishonest way, will at least smile and pass along something that they call smart at election time. I believe that things should be done in elections just as they are in business—absolutely straight, no matter where it is or when it is. In this case the minister thinks we are a little suspicious on this side of the House I am not naturally suspicious, but I confess that I do not like to have voting done for me under the direct control of a strong partisan, even if he is an officer, on the opposite side of politics. I have no doubt that my hon. friends on the other side of the House will make the same objection exactly to a strong partisan who might be on my side of politics. It will work both ways. Why refuse to put the Bill in as good a shape as possible by providing for the appointment of two or three men whose business it will be, if you are going to worry the soldiers about voting, to see that this voting is properly done. That applies more especially, in my judgment to the Bermuda soldiers. The Bermuda soldiers are no more on active service than the soldiers in Ontario. They are simply garrison soldiers and there is no difficulty in sending a commissioner there to see that the voting is properly carried out. There is nothing I can possibly see to hinder that being done in reference to the Bermuda soldiers; nor is there any difficulty in reference to the soldiers at the front. If the War Office will allow you to have these men vote at all they will allow you to send commissioners there to see that the vote is properly taken. They may not allow it at all. I do not know anything about the rules of the War Office. It seems to me ridiculous for you to ask men, who are over there fighting for the Empire, to bother their heads about voting. That is the last thing I would dream of if I were in their places. But if you are bound to have it done why not have it properly systematized and looked after in order that it may be fair to all parties? The soldier would be the last man to suggest that he should be allowed to vote in such a way that when the votes come back to this country there will be nothing but protests and lawsuits over the voting and that is what this Bill means if it is allowed to go through in its present form. Why not accept the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John? It is a perfectly reasonable suggestion. There may be suspicions on the other side of the House as to my hon. friend's suggestion but I do not see in what way they are justified. We are asking for no party advantage whereas the Bill gives my hon. friends opposite a very great party advantage. Personally, I see no reason why the men in Canada should not be allowed to go back to their homes to vote if they are within a reasonable distance. The minister has arranged—and I think it is very much better than it was before—that the voting shall be carried out under proper supervision at the places where these men are at present drilling. In Ontario the distance is not so far and the expense of carriage is not so great that the men should not be permitted to go to their respective homes to vote. With reference to men from the West, the voting can be done as the minister proposes in the Bill. Why not adopt, for those in Bermuda and in Europe the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John and also why not adopt what my hon. friend suggested this morning—that there should be a small committee of three from the other side of the House and two from our side to put this Bill into such a shape that we can all agree upon it and let us get it passed if we are going to pass it. The minister says that we should go over the Bill and pick out the clauses that we disagree about, and that a small committee can be appointed to consider them. That only wastes time, because the basis of the Bill is the whole thing, and the basis is as to how these men are going to be allowed to vote both in Europe and here. Once that is arrived at the other clauses would not cause much trouble to the House. If my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is in earnest in desiring to go on with the Bill why does he not accept the proposition of my hon. friend from St. John and offer

to have a commission appointed that will arrange the details and see that the vote is carried out properly and, in the meantime, appoint a small committee of the House to get the thing worked down to the best form and all agree on it?

Mr. DOHERTY: In regard to the last observation of my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), I have endeavoured to explain the reasons why I do not think the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John is acceptable or feasible. They may or may not carry conviction to the mind of the hon. gentleman, but, of course, they will be no stronger if I repeat them. In regard to his reference to a small committee, I have intimated my willingness, not to refer to a small committee that suggestion, but that the matter be referred to a small committee if something on the line of the plan which I endeavoured to outline this morning be acceptable. I understood from the response of the hon. member for St. John that it was not acceptable; so I do not quite see what is to be gained by going to a committee with a suggestion, which, from our point of view, is not acceptable, and when the principle which I would be disposed to carry out is not acceptable from the point of view of the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is clause 4, which provides for the appointment of scrutineers, to be considered as part of the Bill we are now considering?

Mr. DOHERTY: That clause was drafted for the purpose of submitting it to the leader of the Opposition, with a view of seeing how far it carried out what I understood to be a suggestion made by him, and contrary to what I contemplated it was included in the reprinted Bill. As an alternative to that clause, the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) was put forward, and for reasons that seemed to me and to my colleagues to be sufficient we did not feel that we could accept that suggestion. On the other hand the suggestion I outlined this morning which was in some respects in line with that clause, does not appear to be acceptable to my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) and to other hon. gentlemen opposite, and, therefore, it does not seem useful that we should appoint a small committee to consider two suggestions in regard to each of which part of the committee would go in, having arrived at a conclusion that it would not accept the suggestion of the other part.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is the minister open to consider a proposal by which a clause should be inserted in the Bill which would guarantee supervision of the voting in some way by representatives of both political parties?

Mr. DOHERTY: If there is any reason to suppose that would be satisfactory, I would be very glad to consider it. It might be possible that there should be appointed two commissioners, one representing each political party, who would have the power of scrutineers, with the further power of delegating this power to such persons as they might select, and that the persons so selected should be entitled to be present at any voting and to perform the duties that might be performed by the representative of a candidate if the vote were taken at home. Of course, there would have to be a provision that the absence of these scrutineers would not nullify the proceedings; it would be for the parties to use their own diligence to provide scrutineers.

Mr. MACDONALD: Provided sufficient notice were given?

Mr. DOHERTY: It would be the business of these commissioners to keep themselves informed. I do not think it would be possible to impose on the officers who might be called on to take the vote the obligation to notify the scrutineer every time.

Mr. MARCIL: A day might be fixed for the taking of the vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: I would consider that absolutely impracticable.

Mr. GERMAN: How could you have the scrutineer present?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not asking to have the scrutineers, but I think there might be some advantage in providing scrutineers, and if that would meet the view of hon. gentlemen opposite in any degree, I would be glad to accept it. If it is considered not desirable to have anything at all because you cannot get as perfect a system of scrutineers as you could get in Canada at an election, then I cannot conceive of a system which would be as perfect as the system we have here.

Mr. NESBITT: Why not let the commissioneers take the vote?

Mr. DOHERTY: We may have 50,000 men—

Mr. NESBITT: You will not vote them all one day.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have given my reasons why I do not think it possible that the commissioners could take the vote, and I do not see the usefulness of my discussing that matter over and over again. When you get into the position when an officer commanding 250 men or thereabouts is in the position of a returning officer, and you afford to the representatives of the party an opportunity to select a scrutineer from among these 250 men, and you provide that these two men would be legally entitled to be present when voting is going on, I think you will have gone as far as you can. It will be for the diligence of these scrutineers and for the good faith and camaraderie which we must count upon to exist among officers and men in the same company, to so arrange matters that so far as convenient it would be possible for these men to be present when the votes are being taken. I am not here to press that upon hon. gentlemen opposite, but it has been suggested that there is lack of supervision under the provisions of this Bill, and if a proposition along these lines would be considered to be an improvement from the point of view of supervision, I would be glad to co-operate in putting it into shape.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister be willing to provide that it shall be the duties of the officers, in whose presence the ballots are to be marked, to notify as far as possible these commissioners or scrutineers, so that they should have an opportunity of being present? Otherwise it would be simply a farce to apply what was intended to be a safeguard, and then have the voting done and the ballots returned without the scrutineer knowing when the voting took place.

Mr. DOHERTY: My feeling with regard to the officers whom we are asking to do this work is that we are not imposing this work upon them. They need not do it if they do not want to do it, and I quite realize that we cannot force them to do it. Under the circumstances I am not disposed to ask them to do anything more than is necessary because we have to count upon their goodwill in this matter in a very large measure. The very things that make it difficult for the scrutineer to be present at each of the polls make it equally difficult for the officer to give notice. Is it not fairer that the scrutineer, who is the representative of a party, should do the running around in order to find out when it is necessary to be present, than that you should impose upon the officer the obligation of keeping track of the scrutineer to see that he is present? Do we in this country say: Mr. Deputy Returning Officer, if the scrutineer chooses to go out and be absent, you will send for him before you take a vote? In this country the right of a candidate is the simple right to have a representative, although of course he knows when the polls are going to be held, and the candidate, if he chooses, will send the scrutineer to the polling booth and take chances on his diligence and attention. If for instance my scrutineer is taken suddenly ill on the morning of the election, the law does not ask the deputy returning officer to stop until he gets my scrutineer to the polling booth.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The scrutineer knows the day and the hour of the election.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, he knows the day and the hour of the election. I do not know how often it is necessary for me to argue that conditions at the front are not going to be identical with conditions in Canada. It is a surprise to me that hon. gentlemen should find it necessary to point out so frequently things that are perfectly obvious, such as that things are going to be different at the front, when we all know that. What I am willing to do, so far as it depends upon me to do it, is to accept any proposal or suggestion for making it possible for the parties at their own diligence to supervise the voting, and it does not seem to me to be so difficult a thing as it seems to be considered by some hon. gentlemen. What strikes me is that after the scrutineer is appointed, hon. gentlemen do not think that he ought to make some diligence. He is there as the representative of a party; he is given full power to watch and go around and see when votes are to be taken and inquire; but hon. gentlemen seem to think that nothing is up to him; but that we must go to the officer, who is acting purely because this law asks him to enable people to vote, and impose on him, because we make scrutineers possible, the necessity of his running after the scrutineers. For my part, in pointing out the sort of suggestion that I am prepared to accept, I think I have gone as far in reason as I can go in the direction of endeavouring to secure fairness, and I do not think it is possible for me to go further without creating a situation where you are going so to embarrass this voting

as to make it practically impossible to have the voting carried on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am quite prepared to give my hon. friend credit that he is willing to go as far as he can, but he has given a very severe blow to the Bill. He realizes himself that we have no control and no power over the men who are entrusted with the carrying out of this legislation. In this country we cannot compel a man to become a returning officer or a deputy returning officer; but when a man accepts the position, we can compel him to do what the law says that he shall do. My hon. friend takes the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John that we should have scrutineers, but he realizes himself that scrutineers will be of no avail and can do no good for the purposes we have in view, if they are not notified as to the day on which the polling is to take place. The minister says: I am powerless; I cannot prescribe any duty to the officer to whom I am entrusting the polling. That shows exactly the weak point in this Bill, and that is why the minister should have accepted the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John to create a commission with power to take the vote. Here we are putting upon the statute book a Bill which, when it becomes law, simply gives a pious recommendation to the commanding officers that they should do right; but if they do not choose to act, we have no power over them.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend the minister is making a general proposition, in regard to the voting which is to take place outside of Canada, which is not based on an accurate knowledge of conditions in the places in which the voting is to take place. There is no reason in the world why the men who vote in Bermuda should not vote on a certain stated day under regular conditions, with scrutineers and parties notified, because they are under peace conditions; they are not doing anything in Bermuda except mounting guard, and their votes could be taken without the slightest difficulty.

Mr. NESBITT: The same as in Ontario.

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes, and the same as at Halifax. The same thing applies to the men at Shorncliffe and the other places in England. The men there are drilling; they go through the regular routine of preparation every day, and by proper arrangement all the men in England could vote on one particular date. When you come to the men on the continent, I quite agree with the hon. Minister of Justice that you get into an unknown land, because no one can tell what is going to happen, and our control over the officers who are to take the ballot becomes entirely chimerical. The Minister of Justice, however, having gone so far in stating his position, must recognize the absolute necessity and the fairness of the representations of both parties as to the actual casting of the ballots in Bermuda or in England; otherwise his proposition is of no value at all.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not making a proposition; my proposition is the Bill as it stands.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend knows that it is quite apparent to the House that the general proposition which he has submitted to us to enable soldiers in Bermuda or in England to vote in this peculiar way is most anomalous, and that there is no reason why some solution of the problem should not be submitted. My hon. friend is willing to have a discussion on his Bill as a basis, but he does not want to discuss the proposition put forward by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) of having a commission to undertake the carrying out of the vote at the different places. Being desirous of having satisfactory legislation enacted as regards this matter, I would point out in all sincerity that my hon. friend is failing to recognize the conditions existing in Bermuda, which I pointed out when the right hon. the Prime Minister was here, because there is no doubt that in Bermuda you can take the vote just as it is provided in subsection 5 to take the vote of volunteers in Canada. The difficulty and uncertainty to which my hon. friend refers as arising as to the colonel or commanding officer taking the vote, need not arise in Bermuda. Why should not we have scrutineers and other persons to carry on the election properly? And the same in England. If he is candid —and I believe he is—and wishes to find some solution to this problem, why not take the suggestion he himself has made of providing reasonable scrutineering of the votes in these two countries? When you come to dealing with conditions at the front, we are left unguided by military authority. I think the Minister of Militia should have been in the House to discuss this Bill. He has seen active service, and can tell us how far this will be likely to work out properly. I do not know much about military matters, but I think there are many military informalities in this

Bill, and that it will not work out. When you cross the Channel you come to an unknown land so far as the affairs under this Bill are concerned. What will or will not take place there, neither the Minister of Justice nor anybody in the Government, nor any one in this House, knows anything, nor can he predicate anything of the conditions there. But, before you cross the Channel, while you are still in England, there is no reason why the vote should not be taken under reasonable scrutineering. As to the hon. gentleman's remarks about this matter as a proper subject of discussion, I think he should be willing to extend the basis of discussion, and not seek to confine us within the narrow limits he has indicated. I am satisfied that he cannot make a reasonable answer to the distinction I draw between these soldiers who are not, and those who are, in the field of active hostilities.

Mr. MARCIL: There is nothing to prevent an election meeting being held in Bermuda and the electors informed—or misinformed—as to the issues involved in the election. They could hear any member of the Cabinet who wished to address them. They are nearer to Ottawa than are the electors of Vancouver. You go from here to New York overnight, and twenty-four hours after that you are in Bermuda. When you get there you find conditions absolutely identical with those under which it is proposed soldiers shall vote in Canada. But the unfortunate part of this whole matter is that the people of Canada have no assurance that the vote will be taken in France and Belgium. The Prime Minister has told us that the War Office is the centre of our whole operations, and of everything being done in consultation with the War Office. But if we had assurance that the vote would be taken in Belgium and France we would have more satisfaction in discussing the Bill. We are discussing a Bill that may never be acted upon, and that, I think, is lowering to the dignity of the Parliament of Canada. When we enact laws we should be in a position to know that they will not become a dead letter but will be respected and carried out. We order the officers in France and Belgium to take this vote. But they are officers of the British army and not under our control; if the rules of the army prevent it, the vote will not be taken. This will not redound to the credit of Parliament and of the people of Canada. This is one very weak point in the Bill. Another is that no assurance is given us that the vote that we receive here will be the vote cast by the soldier. I have no doubt that, taken on the whole, the Canadian boys in the army will cast an honest vote guided by the best information which the circumstances allow them to receive. But we have no assurance that the vote so cast will get here. With these grave objections to the Bill, I think this whole discussion is to be regretted. It is another cause of dissension between the two parties that hitherto have been united on all that is necessary to help the Empire in this crisis. We have voted all the money asked for, and have done everything in our power to strengthen the Government's hands. And now, in the dying hours of the session, when we are about to depart for our homes, we are called upon to enact a law here which may be a dead letter and which bears the suspicion of partisanship and may sow the seeds of partisan dissension in the ranks over there. For all these reasons, I hope the minister will reconsider his decision and will accept the proposal of the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. John city, so that we may have the satisfaction of knowing on the night of the general election should it take place—for the Prime Minister told us a few moments ago that we may or may not have an election during the war—that the vote given by the boys at the front is the free expression of those entitled to vote. By accepting this suggestion, the hon. gentleman will close this chapter in our history with an agreement on both sides of the House, which, I earnestly believe, will be satisfactory to the Canadian people and to the boys who represent us at the front.

Mr. NESBITT: The Minister of Justice seemed to think that I was asking questions that had been answered this morning. I was present this morning, but in my place in the House I do not hear the hon. minister when he is talking in his ordinary tone of voice. I did not hear this matter explained this morning. I desire to make this statement in case he should think that I was trying to badger him.

Mr. McKENZIE: I may possibly be alone on this side, but I desire to express myself as being opposed to this Bill in its entirety. I am already on record in that way. I do not make excuses, but declare myself whole-heartedly opposed to this measure. My first reason for this opposition is that this Bill is for a purpose which

cannot be carried out. The minister would have saved himself a great deal of trouble, and would have saved this House and this country a great deal of unnecessary confusion had he said to the zealous partisan, whoever he may be, who proposed this Bill, that the measure could not be allowed to pass. He should have told that partisan that the soldiers of this country have no right to demand or expect any greater rights or privileges than the soldiers of the King in the Mother Country, and that whatever provisions or conditions govern the soldiers of the King in the Mother Country and at the front, the like conditions and provisions should govern the soldiers of the Dominion who cast in their lot with them. Speaking for those who agree with me, I say that we are satisfied with the advancement of the Mother Country so far as civil privileges are concerned. Our most advanced legislation in this country is based on similar legislation in the old land, and when any person advocating this new theory comes to the minister and tells him that the intention is to go further than the old land has gone in such a matter as this, he should say: The officers and soldiers of His Majesty in the old country have no vote while the war is on and they are at the front, and therefore our men should not expect to have votes. One would almost have thought that these considerations would have resulted in the killing of this idea before it got into the shape of a Bill. I can only speak of conditions as they exist in the province from which I come. In Nova Scotia no man may cast a ballot unless his name is duly entered upon the list, after having gone through the regular processes outlined by statute of the local legislature. The franchise is established by the law of the province of Nova Scotia, and that franchise is accepted by the Federal Parliament. This Bill, however, provides an entirely new franchise. It extends the franchise in Nova Scotia beyond the limits which have circumscribed its operations in that province. We have no manhood suffrage in Nova Scotia; every man who gets his name on the list must have certain property or income qualifications. These considerations are, however, thrown to the four winds of heaven by this proposed legislation, and the name of any person who can make the declaration that he was 30 days in Nova Scotia before he enlisted is put on the list. Although we do not know who he is, where he came from or anything about his antecedents, he is given at once the same voice in the government of the province of Nova Scotia as the best citizen in the province. This is a striking departure from the practices to which we are accustomed in Nova Scotia, and it is a departure which should not be undertaken without asking the people of Nova Scotia something about it.

As I read this Bill, the votes are to be placed in one bag, without any special arrangement; the votes for the man in British Columbia are put in the same bag as the votes for the man in Nova Scotia, and no system is provided by which they shall be separated. There is no certainty that the votes will reach their proper destinations, and when they do come to be counted in any particular district, the names are not on any list and no objection can be taken to the ballots. There is no assurance of fair play or justice, so far as I can see. The minister places great confidence in the officers of the militia; out of the honesty of his own heart and mind, I suppose, he thinks that they will be incapable of doing anything dishonest in connection with the recording of these votes. Having had political experience with some of these officers, I think that I would not be doing the minister justice if I did not say something about those experiences. I had occasion less than three months ago to go to an officer, a well-to-do man, whose name it is not necessary that I should mention—a man who would impress the minister, if he saw him, as being a gentleman in whose hands he could safely place the disposition of the ballots. I had occasion to say to him: "Colonel, there is a man in your ranks whom I want as a witness in the Supreme Court in the province of Nova Scotia. I have served a subpoena upon him and paid him his conduct money; I want you to let him go to the court when the day arrives, in order that he may give his evidence." If this man had been desirous of doing the right thing, he would have said: "I see no reason why the man to whom you refer should not be allowed to go to the court-house and give his evidence." Without hesitation, however, he said: "No, I will not allow him to go and give evidence." I had to accept his decision, but I got an order from an officer higher up, at Halifax, directing that the man in question should be sent to the court under an escort. The Minister of Justice would naturally think that the colonel would instantly have complied with this order—but nothing of the kind. He put

the soldier in the hands of a squad of partisans, stole him out of the country to Newfoundland, and kept him there for ten days. The sitting of the court lasted eleven days, and it so happened that the man, thinking that the court was over, came back on the tenth day. He put himself in hiding, but we sent the sheriff after him, brought him into the court-house and heard his testimony. That is my experience with officers in whom the Minister of Justice has such great confidence. This incident occurred during the progress of the war, when, if there is any honour on the part of these officers, it should be manifested. An officer who is capable of stealing a witness away and keeping him out of the country until he thinks that there is no further chance of his testimony being obtained would not hesitate for a moment to change a ballot or to do something which would prevent the ballot from getting to its proper destination. These are reasons which have influenced me to a great extent in opposing the proposal to put the fate of myself and my party friends in the hands of officers of that kind. The officials are at present on the other side of the water in connection with military matters. Since they left this country some of them have been disqualified in the Supreme Court of the province of Nova Scotia; they have been proved guilty of fraud and corruption. They are at the front to-day, and if the services of any men are required for the purposes of an election, these are the very men who will be picked up, because they have had experience in elections when they were at home. The minister, will, therefore, pardon men from Nova Scotia if they do not care to have their political destinies placed in the hands of such men, or that such vast and extensive powers should be vested in such men by Parliament.

Mr. GERMAN: This section deals with the affidavit which the voter has to make. The affidavit may be made out in one of two ways. The first form is:

> That, within the six months immediately preceding the date when I was enlisted... in the military forces of Canada the last place in which I was resident.

was so and so. And then he has to say that he is not qualified to vote in any other electoral district. I should like to call the minister's attention to the fact that a large number of these volunteers will not know whether they are qualified or not. Except in the western provinces, a man has to be on the voters' lists to be qualified, and I am sure that very few of these volunteers will know whether they are on the voters' list or not. The alternative form is

> That immediately before I was enlisted... in the military forces of Canada I was qualified to be a voter at

such and such a place. Suppose that a voter chooses the second form and swears that he is qualified to vote at a certain place, and that when the affidavit comes back it is found that his name is not on the voters' list, would that vote count?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think I have already answered that question. It would appear to me that that is a man who has succeeded in polling his vote by swearing to a false oath. I take it that he would be in the same position as a voter in Alberta who falsely swears that he is a qualified man, and whose vote is taken. I do not see how we could do otherwise than accept such a vote as my hon. friend refers to subject, however, to the parties having the same remedies that they have in regard to a vote in this country which has been polled upon the strength of a false oath. They would not have any remedy, as I understand it, by way of prosecution for perjury.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: I should like to call the minister's attention to an objection that I made this morning. The more I think of it the more impossible I think it will be for the commanding officer to carry out the duties that are imposed upon him by this Bill. A commanding officer has 220 men under him.

Mr. DOHERTY: Is there a commissioned officer who has a smaller unit under his command than a company or a battery or a squadron?

Mr. McLEAN: There is indeed. A company is now divided into platoons under lieutenants, and these platoons are divided into sections under the command of sergeants. Our present company consists of only 48 men, and is commanded by a captain, three lieutenants and four sergeants. The war service unit is much larger. The platoon now is quite as large as the ordinary company in Canada. Under this Bill the commanding officer has to take these affidavits, and certify that the document was written in his presence and that he believes the statements made in the affidavit are true. When all these preliminaries have been gone through the commanding officer gives the

5 p.m.

soldier a ballot, and, after it has been marked, puts it away in a box. I say that it would not be possible for a commanding officer to go through all these preliminaries and take 200 odd votes in a day. For instance, a commanding officer on active service may be under operation orders and be ordered to take his company and put out skirmishers or advance guards or to occupy a certain position. He may be away three or four days or perhaps a week with that particular section. On the other hand, he may have what is called a field officers' day, that is, he has regimental duties to perform in connection with his regiment. This takes him completely away from his company. So it seems to me that it would be impossible for these commanding officers to do this work and their military duties as well. Then there is a provision that if the commanding officer is unable to do the duties imposed by this Bill, the next senior officer shall do what is required. But the next senior officer may be away. It is quite possible that in the Princess Patricias and other regiments, even in the regular service, companies may be commanded by non-commissioned officers during a big engagement. I want the minister to understand that I am not making any criticism except what I consider fair and honest criticism. I should like this Bill to pass if I thought the machinery was effective and workable. I would just ask the minister to consult either with the Minister of Militia or with General Gwatkin, who is the first military member of the Militia Council, and has had a great deal of experence on active service, and take their advice as to whether this is practicable. I should like to see authority given to the commanding officer to appoint any officer he sees fit in case he himself is unable to perform the duties imposed by this Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not quite grasp that it would be an improvement. As I understand it, if the designated officer cannot act, the officer next in rank would act; and if the section does not make that perfectly clear we could modify it so that if the commanding officer is prevented from carrying out the work it may be done, not necessarily by the man next in rank, but by any man between the company commander and the junior lieutenant.

But I shall be glad to make that perfectly clear. The difficulty I apprehend is overcome when we provide that if the the officer commanding cannot do it the next in rank available shall do it.

[Mr. H. H. McLean.]

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: The words are not clear.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will be glad to make them clear. In order to avoid a difficulty which has been raised it is necessary that we shall cut down the number of men handling these ballots to the smallest number. The hon. gentleman heard the objection that was made this morning on the ground of the number of men that was going to handle these ballots. It is desirable to keep these numbers down as low as we can. While it might be true that if the whole 250 men came to vote on the same day it might be difficult for the captain, or major commanding the company, to take the oaths of all at the same time, we are not fixing the day and we are not limiting the hour. Provided that these ballots are taken in time to get back here for the polling day the officers and men voting can suit their own convenience as to the marking of the ballots and under these conditions I would have hoped that it would have been possible for the votes of a company to be taken by the commanding officer, or failing him, by some other officer who would take his place. I do not like the suggestion of his naming somebody. I think it desirable to have it so operated that it will never be a matter of personal choice in determining what officer shall act. It would seem to me to be the fairer way to let the performance of the function attach to the office held by the officer performing it and let it work out in that way so that there will not be a selected officer who might be a partisan of one party or the other. So long as we leave it to operate in such a manner that the officer takes over the duty simply by reason of his military rank it leaves the chances perfectly fair and equal to both parties as to what the partisanship may be, if there be any partisanship. I would rather see it designated as the officer commanding or the officer next in rank, without reference of the choice to the man who is not in a position to do the work himself. My hon. friend believes that a company is too large a unit for us to try to take the vote under one officer. I understand that a company is divided into—

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: Four platoons, each of them under a lieutenant.

Mr. DOHERTY: That there are two parts and that these two parts are subdivided.

Mr. McLEAN: That is the present system in Canada. There are eight companies

in a regiment, but on active service we have only four companies. They are like double companies and each of these companies is divided into four platoons just like separate companies. They are almost as large as some of the ordinary regiments we have in camp. These platoons are again divided into sections under the command of a sergeant.

Mr. DOHERTY: Then if we depart from the commanding officer and go a step further we will have to multiply by four the number of officers that may be handling this matter and we will get it down to a situation where each officer who is handling it will only be concerned with 50 or 60 men. It would hardly be necessary to provide an officer for every 50 or 60 men to take these ballots. I would have hoped that it would have been possible to provide for a company through one officer and really I would think, in view of the fact that he does not have to do it all on the same day, that we might trust to his carrying it through. However, I will think about it and if it is necessary I will be willing to go back to the section.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: There must be some practical method of carrying this thing out on active service and it would be well for the minister to consult with the Minister of Militia, or with men who have had experience and who would be able to suggest a practical solution of the objections that have been made.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall do that before the Bill passes its final stage. In the meantime I beg to move that subsection 2 be amended by inserting in the sixth line, after the word "batteries," the words "or of any line of communication or administrative unit." That is to meet an observation made by the hon. member for Sunbury and Queens this morning.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: That will cover it.

Mr. DOHERTY: It was pointed out by the hon. member for Sunbury and Queens this morning that "companies, batteries and squadrons" would not cover the army service corps and the medical corps and my hon. friend the Minister of Militia suggested these words.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg also to move that subsection 3 of clause 2 be amended in the eighth line by inserting after the word, "batteries," the words, "or of any line of communication or administrative unit."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the minister provide any form of affidavit to be subscribed to by the officer who takes the vote?

Mr DOHERTY: There is no provision in the Bill requiring an officer to be sworn. It occurred to us that we could not prosecute for perjury committed over there, and we have to rely on the moral security. If you swear the officer who takes the vote then somebody would have to administer the oath to him, and you would have to swear that official, too, and finally, unless we got all these men swearing each other we would have to get back to some official on whose certificate we could rely, that the man was sworn. I would be disposed to believe that we can rely on the officer discharging this duty faithfully without exacting from him the additional moral security, because that is all it would be, of his taking the oath. I am not disposed to resist the suggestion, if it is insisted upon, that we should provide a method to swear the officer; but then, of course, we will have to swear the man who swears the officer, and so on, until we get back to some one who is authorized to administer the oath under our own law.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is no reason why the officer in Bermuda or in England should not take an oath before some functionary, and we can provide in this Bill to that end. With every sincere desire to see a workable Act, I wish the minister would see his way clear to provide for the different conditions which exist in Bermuda and England from those which exist where the fight is going on. All a man has to do in Bermuda is to walk down the street on that beautiful island on a sunny day, drop into the office of a notary public, and subscribe to the affidavit.

Mr. DOHERTY: Would the idea the hon. gentleman has in mind be met if we inserted a provision requiring the officers to be sworn before any person authorized to take oaths in the country in which the officer is?

Mr. MACDONALD: It ought to be made imperative in Great Britain and Bermuda.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no objection to an amendment, if the hon. member desires it, to provide that the officer shall be sworn before an official competent to take oaths in Bermuda or Great Britain.

Mr. MACDONALD: I think my suggestion is a reasonable one. I want to say a word now about another matter, and not in any critical sense. We have heard a great deal

to-day about trusting the officers, but yesterday all day we listened to hon. gentlemen on the other side justify their report in regard to the shoes which were furnished to our soldiers, by basing all their speeches on the contention that the report of 75 or 100 regimental boards throughout this country were not worth the paper they were written on, because, forsooth, these men who were sworn to defend their King and country were going about and holding these boards for the mere purpose of getting new boots for the soldiers. It is rather a sudden change in doctrine for hon. gentlemen opposite to come down to-day and tell us that we should trust these officers. Certainly I am prepared to trust them the same as I would trust any other decent citizen of this country, with proper limitations; but we have to make laws here for all classes. I regard the military officers as honourable men, and I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite did not so regard them yesterday. If the minister will only go a little further and give us a sane amendment to this law, so as to provide for a sane system of voting in Great Britain and in Bermuda, he will be carrying out to a legitimate conclusion my proposition to which he has given assent.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It does seem to me that when we are discussing what duties shall be imposed upon military officers, we should have the Minister of Militia present to give us his opinion as to which is the most satisfactory way to have the voting conducted. We are proposing to exact from officers of the British army certain duties of a civil character which may materially interfere with the performance of their military duties, and surely there is no man who ought to know better than the Minister of Militia and his advisers the best mode to adopt in these circumstances. The committee would like to have the opinion of the Minister of Militia on what is a technical military matter, and in respect to which the Minister of Justice would not be supposed to know.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understood the technical question involved was, how many men had to be dealt with in a company and in a platoon, and I am satisfied to take the information which the hon. member for Queens (Mr. H. H. McLean) has given us on that point. I understand that in a company are included four platoons, and that therefore we should consider the desirability of going to the officer who commands a platoon thereby multiplying by four the number of officers. Between the major who commands a company and the officer who commands a platoon, there is no officer who commands any other section of a company. I had an impression that in a company there were officers under the commanding officer, each of whom commanded half of the company.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: There is the major, then the captain, and then the four lieutenants each in command of a platoon, which is divided into two sections each under the command of a sergeant. The minister is quite right in regard to the formation of our regiments in Canada, which are divided into eight companies, but the new British system divides the regiment into double companies, and instead of a captain, there is a major in command.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have said to the hon. member for Queens and Sunbury that before this Bill goes through its final stages, I will consult with the military authorities, with General Gwatkin in particular, and I shall be very glad to come back to this House and impart the information I received, and if it leads to any action being thought desirable, I shall be glad to take it.

With regard to the amendment that the hon. member for Pictou desires, I have tried to put it into suitable words. It would apparently properly come at the end of subsection 4, and this is what I understand ought to be added:

> The officer receiving affidavits and taking votes under the above provisions shall in the United Kingdom and in Bermuda be sworn faithfully to perform his duties before an official authorized to administer oaths under the laws of the country where the said duties are performed.

Does that meet with the idea of the hon. member?

Mr. MACDONALD: There are notaries public in both England and Bermuda.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the notary public is an authorized officer he would come under this.

Mr. MACDONALD: It would be better to put:

> Before a notary public or some other official authorized to administer oaths.

Mr. DOHERTY: Even in England or in Bermuda we are creating a situation where, if by any accident it should happen that officers cannot find this qualified officer, all our machinery will fall to the ground. Will the hon. member consider giving in the alternative the right of the officer being sworn, because we are dealing with a company officer, before the commanding officer?

Mr. MACDONALD: If the duty is done by a subordinate, the commanding officer could administer the oath.

Mr. DOHERTY: We are dealing with company officers, so that there will always be above them a higher officer. I beg to move that subsection 4 be amended by adding thereto the words:

The officer receiving affidavits and taking votes under the above provisions shall in the United Kingdom and in Bermuda be sworn faithfully to perform his duties before the regimental commanding officer, a notary public or any official authorized to administer oaths under the laws of the country where the said duties are performed.

Mr. GERMAN: What right has the regimental officer to administer an oath?

Mr. DOHERTY: The right given by this Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But we have no such power. What power have we to confer upon soldiers who are in England or in France the right to administer oaths?

Mr. DOHERTY: As I have already pointed out, we shall get from this only the moral sanction of the oath. It may be more amusing to hear the statement more frequently, but that is the fact which I concede. As for myself, I have already expressed the view that I entertain upon that subject. I was willing to believe that without the oath we might have trusted the officer.

Mr. GERMAN: Might you not just as well do away with the oath altogether, because you are binding the conscience of no one by any oath that you are prescribing in this Bill?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not understand how the hon. member appreciates conscience, but I think that the average man, if he takes an oath, binds his conscience just as much if he takes it before a non-qualified man, if he takes it in Bermuda or in England or in France, as he does when he takes it in Canada before the most solemnly constituted officer that can be conceived of. I would have been satisfied with my confidence in the officer's honour; but, to meet the objection, I am willing to go further and give the guarantee of the officer's conscience, and I should think that at least we may feel satisfied in resting on the officer's conscientious respect for the oath by which he binds himself upon all that is most sacred to all of us.

Mr. GERMAN: As far as I am concerned, I believe it is as binding on a man's conscience to tell the truth whether he takes an oath or makes a statement. But the hon. gentleman has brought into this Bill what he says is an oath, which is not an oath in the accepted meaning of the term. A man's statement should be just as binding though it were made under this so-called oath before this officer who is appointed to administer it.

Mr. MACDONALD: The proposition the minister is good enough to accept was made by myself in regard to the officers who take the votes in Great Britain and Bermuda. In so far as this amendment provides that the oath should be taken before a notary public or other authorized individual, there is no doubt that in such a case perjury could be assigned. But the minister has added a clause which gives the commanding officer the right to administer the oath. To that alone, I think my hon. friend could take exception, though I think that something might be said in regard to the right of the commanding officer of a regiment in England or in Bermuda to administer the oath with the duties assigned to him under the Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER: They administer oaths in other respects.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BUREAU: On a former occasion I called the attention of the minister to the words "I vote for the Government," "I vote for the Opposition," and "I vote for the independent candidate." Has the minister made up his mind to change these words from "Government" to "Conservative," and "Opposition" to "Liberal?" On a former occasion the hon. gentleman said that he used the terms given here because they were the terms recognized by law. But "independent candidate" is not recognized by law; yet that does not say that a man could not cast a good vote for the independent candidate.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is a general principle that words are to be read in law according to their ordinary significance. I think "independent" is well understood. I said that "Government" and "Opposition" are recognized by law and will not be misunderstood. But if you make it "Liberal" or "Conservative" I do not know how you are going to find either as a matter of fact or as a matter of law an exact definition. For this reason, which I pointed out on previous occasions, I think it better to keep the terms we have.

Mr. BUREAU: There is not a man who is going to cast his vote but knows what is meant by Conservative party and Liberal party. If he does not know it, he is not fit to vote. I do not see why "Government" and "Opposition" should be used in our ballot; it has never been done in our elections, and it is not a fair way to put it. Under this Bill, questions relating to the parties are referred to the discussion of the leaders of the party. I think we should use in this law words that are intelligible and will allow the soldier to give an intelligent vote. As to the independent candidate, I think that should be left blank. The candidate who does not belong to either of the great parties may be a Labour candidate, a Socialist candidate, or a Nationalist candidate, for all I know.

Mr. DOHERTY: But a fourth alternative is allowed under which the soldier may vote for the individual. The independent candidate I would understand to be the one who presents himself as independent as between the Government and the Opposition, whether he counts himself a socialist or gives himself some other title.

Mr. BUREAU: Suppose there were two Conservative candidates. I suppose the interpretation given to the word "Government" would be in favour of the candidate who was chosen by the convention. And the same with the Liberal candidate. But suppose that the Conservative candidate who has not been chosen by the convention has a majority of votes of those who heard him and saw him, but when these soldiers' votes come in, the votes of men who have not seen and heard, they give the majority to the other candidate. In that case, surely these votes should be eliminated and let the election go to the man who was the choice of the people.

Mr. CROTHERS: Subsection 7 deals with that.

Mr. BUREAU: That provides that the leaders shall elect. I say that is unfair.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would call the attention of the minister to the case of the two constituencies in Halifax city and county, and St. John city and county. The voter in either of those constituencies would be entitled to two papers and entitled to vote for both a Government and Opposition candidate. I do not doubt that many hundred voted that way in the last election. In Halifax there must have been many who voted both for the Prime Minister and for my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). Has any provision been made for that point?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not see how we can find a method, so long as the men have not sufficient information to justify their picking out any special candidate. While the soldiers may not have official information as to who the candidates are, it is probable that in respect of many constituencies the soldier will know, just as all of us know, who are going to be the candidates. The soldier who has that information will be able to avail himself of the opportunity afforded him to vote for a particular person. Under the provisions of the general act a man is entitled to vote for as many people as there are candidates to be elected, and if a gentleman voting in the constituency of Halifax should vote for two persons upon that ballot, if they prove to be candidates his votes would be counted. But the person who has absolutely no knowledge of who the candidates are, and is unable with absolute certainty to vote for them by name, has the right to vote for the Government or for the Opposition.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How about giving him two ballots, and permitting him to split his vote, if he wishes to do so?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is this difficulty; if you hand the man two ballots and he does take his chance on voting for a particular person, we may get two votes for the same man. I think that the persons who would wish to vote for one candidate on one side and one on the other are not very numerous.

Mr. MARCIL: If a voter votes for a particular person who does not happen to be a candidate, is the vote lost?

Mr. DOHERTY: The vote is lost. I do not think we can avoid that; it is the general provision of the law.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to have as thoroughly established as possible whether or not the Government has any authority over the officer, whoever he may be, who will handle the ballots in Europe, in England or in Bermuda.

Mr. DOHERTY: All these paymasters are our own officers. What we were discussing the other day was the question as to whether we can convict a man in this country for a criminal offence committed outside of this country. The right hon. leader of the Opposition expressed the

opinion that we could not, and I am not prepared to dispute that opinion. Our officers, going into the Imperial army, are officers of the Imperial army for the time being, but when they return to this country, as we hope they will, they will return as officers of our miliary organization. I am not prepared to say what remedy may exist for any misconduct on their part during their absence. I am willing to assume that we shall have no recourse under the criminal law for infractions that they may commit under this particular Act. I do not want to say, however, that we have absolutely no authority that may be exercisable sooner or later by reason of the position which they will have occupied.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to find out exactly what the measure of our authority is. The exercise of that right on the part of the soldier, that we are taking some trouble here to give, depends on the conduct of the officer who is to act as returning officer. I think it has already been stated—I only want to have it absolutely defined—that that officer acts, or does not act, as he sees fit, and we have no remedy.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think that we can by any means within our power give ourselves a method of compelling a man in England to do something. We are empowering these officers to do these things. I do not want to go further than this: I am willing to concede that we cannot deal with these men under the criminal law in respect to things that they may do outside of this country. These men are, of course, in a peculiar position, and it is not very easy absolutely to define what our powers may or may not be in the direction of increasing their obligations. While they are, for the purposes of military operations, under the control of the Imperial authorities, they are still our officers, and are paid by us. I am not prepared to concede that, so long as we limit ourselves to things that have no concern in actual military operations, our law is not effective to create obligations with regard to them, nor am I prepared to-day to undertake positively to affirm that it is. While I am not asking the committee to pass this Bill upon the expectation of its being carried out by our creating legal obligation, I think we can safely rest assured that when the Parliament of Canada empowers these officers to do these things—and, so empowering them, in effect requests them—in the great bulk of cases the officers will be willing to carry out what they are empowered to do, to put themselves to such pains as may be involved in doing the things that are prescribed here in order to enable the soldiers to register their votes.

Mr. OLIVER: It is an absolute fact that it is entirely optional with the paymasters whether they act or not?

Mr. DOHERTY: I can make no further declaration than I have made.

Mr. OLIVER: From what the minister has said I am bound to conclude that that is the fact. We are passing this law ostensibly to give the soldiers the right to vote, but we are not providing the means which will ensure their having that right. I will admit that it is because we cannot.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We can by appointing a commission.

Mr. OLIVER: But as this Act stands we cannot do it. Therefore, let us be honest and say that we are holding out to the soldier a prospect which after all depends not upon our legislation, but upon the officers in charge.

Mr. DOHERTY: We can create an obligation just as strong, just as powerful, just as binding upon those gentlemen as any obligation we can create upon a commission appointed by statute. There is absolutely no possible distinction in that regard. I have said that I was not conceding that we have not the power to create legal obligations upon these officers over there. I have conceded, without doing any more than conceding it, that we cannot punish the men for a criminal offence committed outside of this country. I have further stated that it was not in reliance upon our imposing a legal obligation on the officers that we proposed this measure, but that we did believe that they, being empowered to do this, and Parliament putting before them the desire of the people of Canada, would carry it out. I have not affirmed that these are absolutely legal obligations, nor have I conceded that they are not. I do not think it is useful to discuss that now. But I am quite prepared to say that the obligation is just as incumbent upon them as would be the obligation that we, by a statute, would seek to impose upon a commission to perform duties outside of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I beg to differ from the minister, and differ entirely. In the present Bill the minister is proposing to invest certain functions in gentlemen over whom this Government and this Parliament have

absolutely no control. These officers are a part of the British army and under the absolute control of the British War Office, and they have no right to do a single thing outside of the performance of their military duties except with the consent of the War Office or of the officers who are in command of the forces at the front; and no one knows that better than my hon. friend. But suppose that a commission such as was proposed in my amendment was appointed by the Governor in Council. Those commissioners accept the office, they accept the responsibility, and they accept the remuneration which goes with the performance of their duties. Surely that is a different case from imposing obligations upon gentlemen in England or France or Belgium or Bermuda over whom this Parliament has no authority whatever. The moment those commissioners accept the office they become the officials of this Government.

Mr. DOHERTY: But how will they carry out their duties except through these same people?

Mr. PUGSLEY: With the consent of these people.

Mr. DOHERTY: And so does our Act.

Mr PUGSLEY: No, this Act imposes the duty upon these people in England or France to perform the obligations. On the other hand the commissioners would go to England, France or Belgium as the appointees of this Government, and they could be sworn in in Canada to discharge their duties. They would perform their duties with the consent of the British authorities. That is an entirely different case. In the case of a commission you have a proper tribunal, a tribunal appointed by this Government, accepting office under this Government, and undertaking the duties of the position under this Government. In performing their duties on the other side they would be doing it with the consent of the British authorities and of the officers who are acting under the War Office. Under a commission you have a properly constituted body, but in the other case you are professing to impose duties on persons over whom you have not a shadow of jurisdiction.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Chairman, before recess I was speaking of the great advantage there would be in appointing a commission, as proposed in my amendment, over the proposition of imposing upon the officers of the British army duties and obligations which they might or might not be willing to discharge. I am satisfied that the proposition of a commission is a very desirable one, and if the minister will not accept it I beg to give notice that when this Bill comes to its third reading I will move this amendment, and also to strike out the sections which will be unnecessary if the amendment is adopted. The minister stated when the Bill first came before the House that one of the strong justifications for the Government in taking up the measure was that New Zealand had already provided similar legislation, but a careful examination of the New Zealand Bill shows that they did not presume to do any such thing as is sought to be done by this Bill. They did not presume to cast upon the officers of the British army the duty of seeing the ballots marked, taking affidavits and certifying to papers which were to be sent back to that country, but they provided that, in the case of soldiers who were on duty in New Zealand preparing to go to the war, they should be allowed to vote by marking their ballots before they left, and that if a general election came on, their ballots could be counted. They also provided that, in the case of soldiers who had left New Zealand as members of any expeditionary force before the passing of the Act, they should be allowed to vote in the manner prescribed, and they provided that electoral officers should be appointed out of New Zealand for the purpose of taking their votes. Section 8 of the New Zealand Act reads as follows:

> Electoral officers may be appointed out of New Zealand for the purpose of enabling any person to record his vote under this Act who is a member of any expeditionary force sent out of New Zealand before the passing of this Act.

This is exactly the same provision which is made by my amendment, with this exception, that this amendment contains a greater safeguard for non-partisanship because it provides that the electoral officers, which the commissioners would be, should be appointed upon the nomination of the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition respectively. Otherwise it is the same. It seems a strange thing, that modelling this legislation, as the Government pretend to do, upon the legislation of New Zealand, they should adopt the course of imposing obligations upon the officers of

the British army which the Government and Parliament of New Zealand evidently thought was impracticable and unreasonable, and as to the undertaking of which obligations the Government has not the slightest information. The Minister of Justice has frankly informed us that he really does not know whether the officers of the British army will perform the obligations. It seems a very extraordinary thing to pass this legislation, which may be for that reason alone an absolutely dead letter. The Government could easily provide the machinery, by the appointment of a commission, the members of which would be non-partisan electoral officers, and who could, with the aid of the regulations which they might make, see that the provisions of the Act would be fairly and honestly carried out and that all the soldiers desirous of voting would have a reasonable opportunity of doing so, and who would also see, and that is a most important thing, that the ballots which would be marked by the soldiers entitled to vote would be returned to Canada and would actually be deposited. On the contrary, this Bill proposes to impose obligations on British officers which this Parliament has no right to impose. There is in the Bill a lamentable absence of those safeguards which one would suppose the Government would have had in mind in asking Parliament to assent to the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to draw the minister's attention to the condition which results from the fact that, I think, we have agreed upon, that the officer who acts as a returning officer does so at his own option. He acts or he does not act, as he pleases. The purpose of the Bill is to give the soldier an opportunity of casting his ballot. That opportunity depends on the whim of the officer appointed; there is no obligation on him to take action and, as the minister put it, there is before him only an expression of the desire of the Parliament of Canada that he should act. Beyond that there is no authority or compulsion or obligation upon him. If I remember rightly, in considering the Bill at its earlier stage, the minister took occasion to say that a certain provision, which it was difficult to give effect to, was inserted so that there would not be a dislocation of the voting power of the country. We are making provision for the voting of the overseas contingents. We are assuming to make provision for the full number of the members of that contingent to exercise their franchise. Ostensibly we are doing that. On the face of the Act we are doing that. We are placing this matter absolutely in the hands, under the control and at the option of the men whom we may name for certain positions which they are under no obligation either legal or moral to fill. It is only reasonable to believe that under these circumstances some soldiers will have the opportunity of voting and some will not. We have no means of guidance as to what proportion of these will have an opportunity and what proportion will not. Surely, therefore, of necessity, under the conditions laid down in the Bill, there will be just as great a disarrangement of the voting power of the country as there would have been under the terms that my hon. friend objected to at the earlier stage of the proceedings. If we cannot do better than that, if we cannot be reasonably sure that every volunteer is going to have the opportunity of casting his vote, let us not claim that we are doing something that we actually are not doing. It may be that we are showing good-will, it may be that our intentions are all right, but unless we can do what we profess to be doing, let us not claim that we are doing it. Let us admit that we have undertaken to do something that in the nature of things it is not possible to do. I submit to the minister that when the operation of any law cannot reasonably or measurably be assured it is more than doubtful whether there should be such a law at all. By giving unequal opportunity to one portion of our volunteers to vote while in fact denying to others the same opportunity we are not increasing the share of control of the affairs of Canada by the volunteers as we profess, but we are endangering the reasonable result of a fair expression of opinion by the people who are not on active service. This cannot be the purpose of the minister, but it is the actual fact. I feel I would not be doing my duty if I did not set that view before the minister for his best consideration.

Mr. DOHERTY: The officers have been referred to, and no doubt correctly, as British officers, but in the great majority of cases, if not in all, the officers dealing with our soldiers will be Canadian officers. It may be possible that some of them may decline to act, but the effect of the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite is that because of the unwillingness of some of the officers to perform this duty this law might become ineffective in some instances,

that therefore we should not pass the law at all. Does anybody conceive that more than a small minority (if there be any at all), of our officers having this power conferred upon them, will refuse to exercise it? There is already provision in the Bill that if any officer designated in this Act is prevented from discharging the duty it may be performed by the officer next in rank below him. I would understand that to mean that if the officer next in rank below him was prevented from doing it, then the next below him might act. When we come to that section I shall put in words which will make my interpretation of that absolutely clear. I think it is a very weak argument, that because in some instances this Act may fail of its operation for want of good-will on the part of some officer, we should abandon entirely the project of providing votes for our soldiers on active service. I do not think that our authority over the officers on active service would be in any way enhanced or increased by our naming a commission, which commission would themselves undertake to deal with that same class of officers; we cannot delegate greater powers to the commissioners than we ourselves have.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister transfer his mind to the case of an ordinary constituency and ask himself would he consider it fair that, there being set off certain polling divisions in that constituency, it was optional with those who might be selected as deputy returning officers whether a poll should be held or not.

Mr. DOHERTY: If that condition should exist, would the hon. gentleman suggest as a remedy that we should disfranchise the whole constituency and give no one an opportunity to vote?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not suggesting that. The minister must admit that such a condition would be unthinkable, looking toward a fair expression of the opinion of people in ordinary circumstances, and is it not absolutely just as unfair in securing a full expression of opinion by the soldiers? While the individual citizen has the right to have his vote recorded, the whole body of citizens has also a right in the election, and that right is that the election shall be so conducted that there shall be no disarrangement of the general body of the vote, and that there shall be a full, and fair, and as complete as possible an expression of opinion of all who are entitled to vote. If the minister, in granting the right to the individual, must take away from the right to which the whole body of citizens is entitled, he surely should reconsider his position.

His suggestion that my view was that if we could not vote all the men, we should not vote any, is hardly a fair statement to make. Under the proposal of the hon. member for St. John, whereby commissioners who would be under the authority of this Parliament would be in bodily presence on the other side of the water, these commissioners would have an opportunity of selecting officers who would be willing to act and whose consent they would have before appointing them, and therefore, although there would not be compulsion, there would be assurance that the action would be taken that was necessary to enable the soldier to poll his vote. That is the difference between the proposal made by the hon. member for St. John and the proposal of the minister, which is simply to issue an order to certain men that they shall take certain action, when there is not a shred nor tittle of authority to compel them to take that action or to lay obligation on them for the taking of that action. The minister has laid considerable stress on the idea that because this Parliament says that an officer should act as returning officer, therefore he is in some way not compelled, but made to feel that he ought to take the action that Parliament desires him to take. I do not look upon the matter in that light at all. The officer as well as the soldier is on the other side of the water for a certain definite, specific purpose, in the carrying out of which discipline is one of the first necessities. As regards action by the officer acting as a returning officer or acting as political agent, or a scrutineer,—because if you are going to have a returning officer you should have scrutineers as well—the large majority of officers will say: this is an undue and improper interference with the important business that we are here to attend to; we do not think the Government or the Parliament of Canada was well advised in imposing this duty upon us, and we decline to act. I think that will be the proper view to be taken by officers on the other side, and I believe it is the view that will be taken by a large majority of them, at any rate by those who have a full appreciation of the duties that they are there to fulfill.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would not take up any further time on this subsection were it not

for the extraordinary statement made by the Minister of Justice that the Government would have no more control over the commissioners, who might be appointed under the amendment which I proposed, when they reached the other side than it would have over the officers.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think that is the statement I made. I stated that we would have no greater control in any event over the men on the other side because it was exercised through commissioners than we would have by exercising it directly. We cannot give the commissioners a greater power than we ourselves have.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is putting the case a little differently. When my hon. friend uses the word "men," does he mean the commissioners and their delegates?

Mr. DOHERTY: The people that the commissioners may work through over there. We can have no more control over them, because we have named the commissioners, than we can exercise directly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is entirely wrong. Suppose, for instance, that the commissioners go to France or Belgium. Surely they go there under an agreement with this Government to act as electoral officers or commissioners. There is a contractual obligation into which they have entered with this Government to discharge certain duties, and that obligation they are bound in law to carry out. Suppose they want assistance, they appoint delegates to act for them; they make contracts with these people so to act and to discharge the duties which are required to be performed under the statute. Does not that create as against the people so appointed a contractual obligation? Surely it does; but as to those gentlemen who are officers in the British army, some of them are Canadian officers or were Canadian officers until they went under the control of the British War Office, and the moment they go under that control, this Government has no control over them whatever. On more than one occasion in the House that has been the statement made by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Militia. I remember early in the session I asked the Minister of Militia if he had received any complaints from England as to the separation of the units of the troops which had gone from New Brunswick. He said that there had been some correspondence, but that this Government had no control over the men whatever; that when they landed upon the shores of England, they were absolutely under the control of the British War Office; and that they then formed part of the British army. The same statement was made again by the Prime Minister, when the case of Col. Struan Robertson came before us, that this Government must not interfere; that there must be no divided authority. Yet this Parliament is asked to impose an obligation upon these officers who are under the control of the War Office to perform civil duties for this Government in connection with the holding of the elections of this Parliament. Surely the position of these officers, as far as this legislation is concerned, would be entirely different from that of the commissioners, who had undertaken with this Government for a consideration to perform the duties of electoral officers under this legislation, and it would also be entirely different from that of the delegates whom the commissioners might appoint and who would enter into a contract with them. Take the case of the Acting High Commissioner in London, who is outside of the territorial jurisdiction of this country, but who is under the control of this Government, because when he accepted the office of Acting High Commissioner, he became bound under his contract to perform the duties which pertain to the office which he is filling. The same is true as regards the agent of Canada in Paris, who is out of the territorial jurisdiction of this country, but who is under a contractual obligation to perform his duties as agent in Paris. It seems to me that the case is not arguable at all. These commissioners would, as I have said, be like the electoral officers who were appointed under a contract with the New Zealand Government that for a certain consideration they would discharge their duties. But, as my hon. friend from Edmonton points out, this Government is asking the people to believe that it is making arrangements to enable the soldiers to cast their ballots. If they are not arranging to do that, then they are doing a great injustice to many of the boys at the front. Though this is what they profess, yet the minister himself admits frankly—he is compelled to admit—that there may be cases in which these officers will decline to act and by reason of that the votes of the soldiers under those officers may not be taken. Whether there will be a large number or a small number in that position the minister is unable to give us any idea. In answer

to the hon. member for Edmonton, the minister says: Suppose some returning officer should decline to act, should decline to hold a poll, shall we therefore disfranchise the people? Surely, that is not a parallel case. The returning officer is not relied upon to act unless he has agreed to act; he gets a certain compensation for acting; there is a contractual obligation upon him. And I am inclined to think it would be the law—I think it is undoubtedly clear—that if for any reason a poll is not held—the judges would declare the election void and another election would have to be held. Talk as the minister may, he is imposing upon these officers duties which he knows they cannot be required to perform, obligations which he cannot assure the House they will carry out, yet he is making profession that this Bill will enable the soldiers to exercise their right of franchise. He believes that there may be cases. I believe there will be many, many cases affecting thousands of our soldiers—in which they will not be given opportunity to exercice their franchise, whereas, if he took the simple course of following the example of New Zealand, and appointing electoral officers, letting them go to England, France and Bermuda, letting them make arrangements for delegates and assistants to carry out the provisions of the Act, he would be able to give reasonable assurance to the Canadian soldiers that they would all have an opportunity to cast their votes.

Mr. VERVILLE: I do not rise for the purpose of discussing any of the articles of the present section. As the Minister of Justice knows, I spoke a few days ago about granting the right to vote to others than soldiers. Every member of the House knows that there is a certain class, a class of labour men especially, who are deprived by their occupation of the opportunity of cast their votes. I refer particularly to the railway men. A year ago, I believe, a letter was presented to the committee and an argument was made in favour of giving these men opportunity to use their franchise which was kindly received by the minister and by the members of the committee. This year a letter was sent and an argument presented which also was well received by the minister and the members of the committee. It seems to me that while we are spending so much time in finding a way to give votes to the soldiers we should add a section to this Bill which would cover the railway men. Of course, everybody will admit that if these men are sent to work early in the morning of election day, it is impossible for them to cast their votes. They are not like nearly all other classes whose occupation enables them to remain near their homes and within easy reach of the polling places. These men must be ready to take out their trains on schedule time, and it is absolutely necessary for the business of the country that they should fulfil that duty. They might be required to take away a train load of soldiers or a train load of munitions of war. They would thus be actually assisting in the carrying on of the war, and yet would be prevented from voting, while the soldiers would have opportunity to vote. The railway men tell me, and I accept it on their authority, that forty per cent of these men are prevented from polling their votes. I have a subsection to propose, which, I think, will overcome this difficulty. I think it should come in after subsection 4, and it might, if the minister wishes, be numbered 4a. I submit it in the form of an amendment and shall be glad if the minister will say whether he is in favour of it or not. He may say that it is a question of establishing the machinery to enable these men to vote. We have talked so much about machinery that it seems to me we ought to be in a position to organize machinery of any kind, especially for a purpose like this, which is to take the votes of people who remain within the country and not as in the case of the soldiers, to take the votes of those who are outside of the country. I do not know that I am absolutely in order in moving this amendment now, but I submit it in the hope that I am in order:

Railway conductors, railway engineers and brakemen, and all other railway employees, who are detailed for train service, shall have the option to cast their vote on polling day in the regular manner provided by law, or on the day before polling day in the following manner, to wit:

The railway employee, at any time between the hours of eight in the morning and six in the evening, shall present himself to the deputy-returning officer of the polling subdivision in which he is or may be, inscribed, who, in the presence of two witnesses, shall administer to him all the oaths required by law and shall then give him a ballot paper. The railway employee may thereupon mark the ballot paper in the usual manner provided by law and the deputy-returning officer shall then place the same in the envelope, upon the back of which shall be endorsed a certificate in form "c," mutatis mutandis, which certificate shall be signed by the deputy-returning officer and witnesses, and shall securely close the envelope. The envelope containing such ballot paper shall then be sent by the deputy-returning officer by post to the returning officer, who shall open the envelopes and count the ballots and in-

clude them in his returns in the manner provided by law.

This is submitted as embodying the best way to enable these men to cast their votes. Of course, there are many different ways by which it could be done, and this is not exactly the way proposed to the minister and the committee. While these are absentee votes, yet they are the votes of men who are in a position to know exactly who are the candidates in their several divisions. The letters sent to the committee a couple of years ago were signed by C. Lawrence, legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 200 Elgin street, Ottawa W. L. Best, legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, 576 McLeod street, Ottawa; and J. H. Hall, legislative representative of the O. of R. C., Carleton Hotel, Ottawa. My hon. friend will observe that the three men who signed that letter had a certain amount of responsibility on their shoulders. One represented the railway conductors, another the firemen and another the engineers. This demand must have reached a good many members of the House; I am sure that any railway man with whom they talked on the subject must have spoken of the manner in which railway men are handicapped on polling day.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. gentleman that the title of this Bill is: "An Act to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise."

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The hon. member is speaking to his amendment.

Mr. VERVILLE: Am I out of order, Mr. Chairman, in moving this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: The subsection actually under discussion is subsection 4. If the hon. gentleman is in order in offering an amendment, I do not think that this is the proper time to offer it, because subsection 4 deals with the manner in which the vote shall be registered by the soldiers.

Mr. VERVILLE: It seems to me that the proper place to introduce such an amendment as I suggest is immediately between subsections 4 and 5.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The hon. member for Maisonneuve is moving to add a section, 4a, to the Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: Personally I have no desire to insist on any point of order; I am quite willing to answer what the hon. gentleman has asked. We are dealing with subsection 4 of section 2, prescribing the details of how the soldiers shall register their votes under section 1 and the first subsection of section 2. The amendment which the hon. gentleman proposes is hardly an amendment to the method by which soldiers shall exercise the right of voting. If the hon. gentleman wants to introduce another section, it ought to come at the end of section 2. However, perhaps that is not material. The hon. gentleman has pointed out, very correctly, that the railway men have pressed for a method by which they may exercise their franchise. He has also very correctly said that I have every sympathy with their endeavour to have a means provided by which they may vote. I may point out in the first place, however, that the remedy which they ask for differs totally and entirely from the method suggested by my hon. friend. I have had many communications on the subject; the matter was dealt with in the committee, and I feel confident that I make no mistake in saying that they made no suggestion of this particular method of voting that is now asked for on their behalf by the hon. gentleman. If we should provide a method for them to vote, I certainly think that the method they asked for would be very much more effective than this. The committee went into this question in connection with the Dominion Elections Act generally, both last year and this year we gave it a good deal of consideration. The committee, as a whole, came to the conclusion that it was not a practicable method. I am not sure that if I had been alone on that committee I would not have felt it possible to have worked the matter out, but, as the hon. gentleman knows, when we came to deal with the Dominion Elections Act generally at this session, we did not, save as regards one or two separate and distinct things, endeavour to deal with that matter at all. If the hon. gentleman really wants to help the railway men and all other persons who are interested in a further recognition of the right of people who cannot present themselves at the polls during the polling hours to have their vote, it would seem to me that the wisest course to follow would be to aid us in putting forward this first measure for this particular class of men who are away from the country and who are prevented from voting, not because they are attending to their own work, but because they are attending directly to the work of the public. I am sure that railway

men would be the first to recognize the difference between the two classes of voters. One is the class of men who, in the exercise of their employment, find themselves prevented from voting. That is a case with which I have the very greatest sympathy, but at the same time it is not an absolutely analagous case. The hon. member has witnessed in this House the strong feeling of antagonism that has been shown to the idea of trying to provide a method by which people can vote otherwise than with all the formalities in the way which are provided for the public generally. That feeling we have to overcome. We are having, as the hon. member witnessed, some little difficulty in overcoming it, even in this exceptional case of the soldiers. Does not the hon. gentleman think that he will do more to aid the cause of those who, for other reasons, seek to have another method of absentee voting adopted, if he will help this Bill to go through, and allow us to demonstrate, in the face of the apprehension and fears that have been expressed, that you can safely provide for absentee voting? I certainly would not favour the adoption of the method suggested by my hon. friend. It is a method that, so far as I know, the railway men have not asked for; it is one which makes it absolutely out of the question that candidates or their representatives should be notified or have any opportunity of being present. It is quite true that that may happen, out of absolute necessity, in the case with which we are dealing, but there is no absolute necessity for it in the case which the hon. member brings forward. The best way to help all persons interested in the recognition of the right of those who cannot present themselves at the polls to vote is to profit by this particular case, which presents a peculiar claim to the exercise of the right, and to allow the results of this proposed legislation to demonstrate the feasibility and practicability of providing for absentee voting. I am satisfied that the passing of this measure and its successful operation will be the most effective method of helping to meet the desire of the railway men.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand that last year, when the committee was considering amendments to the Elections Act, the railway men applied to have their case considered; and this is a letter which I understand was addressed to my hon. friend as chairman of the Committee.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Ottawa, March 11, 1914.

Hon. C. J. Doherty, Esq.,
Chairman and Member of Committee
on the operation of the Election Act,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Dear Sir:

On account of the peculiar nature of their work which necessitates them being away from their home terminal on election day, a large percentage of railway men in train service are disfranchised and we would request that your committee who are considering amendments to the Election Act, take into consideration the adoption of some plan whereby a much larger percentage of railway employees could avail themselves of the privilege that rightly belong to all good citizens, namely, that of using their franchise.

Therefore we desire to submit the following proposition for your earnest consideration: That at all railway centres or divisional points the polling be extended to two days by placing the ballot box in charge of some responsible person who will be stationed at some convenient point the day prior to the day on which the election is to be held for the purpose of allowing those employees to vote who might be away from home on the regular election day. If there is more than one railway running into an electoral district with more than one terminal, have a separate ballot box for each terminal.

The only difference which exists between the amendment that has just been submitted to the House, and the suggestion contained in the letter addressed to my hon. friend last year, is that the latter suggested that the voting should take place at divisional points, whereas the amendment before the House suggests that the men should vote at their place of residence either on polling day or the day before. This point, however, is not material. If the Government is not disposed to consider the amendment, I would observe to my hon. friend that last year when he and the committee presented to the railway men the difficulties and objections which existed in connection with having a separate law for any class of the community, these reasons seemed satisfactory to the railway men, and they did not press their views further. But this year, when they found that the Government was making a separate law for one class of our fellow citizens, who, whatever may be the reason, will not be able to vote as the rest of the citizens will vote, the railway men naturally came to the conclusion that the same privileges should be allowed to them; and that is the reason for their demand. My hon. friend says: Oh, let us pass this law, and it will help the railway men in attaining their object. If it is reasonable to have special legislation for one class of the community what objection can there be to giving the same privi-

leges to another class, which for one reason or another, is also prevented from polling in the regular way? The soldier is at the front doing his duty, but the railway man is doing his duty also, and it is just as important to the community. It is true that he is earning his living in the discharge of that duty, but every citizen in the community is working for a living, and every one is performing his duty to the state. It seems to me that my hon. friend is well justified in presenting his amendment; but if the Government will not accept it that is the end of it.

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the committee that we are discussing clause 2 of the Bill. This amendment has been introduced as a new section to the Bill, to be known as 4a, and I therefore think it should be presented after we have studied section 4. If it is the desire of the House to discuss this amendment at this stage I have no objection, but I think it is out of order.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not wish to question the ruling of the Chairman, neither do I wish to insist upon it, but I might just point out that it is perhaps not of material importance whether we discuss it on section 4 or on the present section, for we have already discussed it to some extent.

The CHAIRMAN: Suppose this amendment was adopted; where should I put it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: After section 4.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is the desire of the committee to discuss the amendment now, I have no objection.

Mr. OLIVER: I think the proper time to discuss the amendment is after we dispose of section 3.

Mr. VERVILLE: As we were discussing almost every clause of the Bill I thought it was perfectly in order to present my amendment; however, I am perfectly willing to withdraw it and present it at the proper time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If the minister will not accept it, that disposes of it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Perhaps it is not quite fair to say that I do not accept the amendment, but I hardly think it comes within the scope of the Bill. As the matter has been taken up I should just like to say this, with the permission of the Chairman: The committee that reached the conclusion that it did with regard to the difficulties in the way of providing this form of voting for the railway men dealt with this matter last year, and also considered it again this year, but not in connection with this measure. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the committee was originally constituted to consider the Dominion Elections Act and the Controverted Elections Act, and that later on this question of votes for soldiers was specially referred to it. Now I cannot quite accept the view of the right hon. gentleman, that because we are making this measure in regard to the soldiers it alters the situation with regard to the railway men. I have the advantage and pleasure of knowing a great many railway men, and perhaps the men who have shown the most active and intelligent interest in this movement to get votes, and I am satisfied that I shall have their endorsement when I say that they themselves will not pretend that their case, from the point of view of the cause that prevents their voting, is analagous to that of the soldier. We thought—and I say it notwithstanding my very high respect of the railway men of this country—that the soldier stood in a peculiar position as compared with every other class of

9 p.m. people who are staying at home; and we are trying to deal with that very special and peculiar position. For myself, I am as sincerely in favour of meeting the desire of the railway men in this regard as my hon. friend who has made this amendment, and I say that without any reflection on his sincerity. But after what we heard pro and con in the committee, and in view of the manner in which the matter was viewed by the committee, and particularly when I think of the difficulties which we met in this House when we did come with a minor proposition, but which looked to a certain extent to facilitating the voting of the railway men—I refer to the proposition to open the polls at an earlier hour in the day—in the face of all those facts I cannot think that one can do better service to the railway men and others who desire that we should arrive at a system whereby a man who cannot actually present himself at the polls may vote, than by giving the system support and a fair trial in this special case, when the opportunity for bringing it into force is furnished by the very special and peculiar position of those on whose behalf it is asked. Under the circumstances I cannot feel otherwise than that the suggestion of this amendment cannot be looked upon as something that can be expected to be acted upon in conne tion with this Bill. I do not think

we should embarrass this measure, when we are having such very great difficulty in having it assented to by this House, by introducing into it at this stage, and without notice of any kind, a proposal in regard to which opinions might be held on lines other than those which would naturally be expected to bear on a Bill such as that before the House.

Mr. VERVILLE: I hope the minister will believe that I had no intention other than to give the right of voting to railway men. I do not see why this would prevent the present Bill from passing. It has nothing to do with the passage of the measure. It has been stated time and again that the Government are not willing to pass class legislation. Do they characterize legislation of this kind affecting the interests of the railway men as class legislation? We are passing class legislation to-day. Of course, it is for the soldiers but it is class legislation to a large extent. It may be class legislation in the proper sense of the word. If you are going to give soldiers now at Montreal or Valcartier votes you must pass class legislation for the purpose because there are soldiers at Valcartier who could go to Quebec and other cities and deposit their ballots in their own polling places. These railway men are not in a similar position. They may be away down at Rivière du Loup, and if they want to vote for any hon. gentleman opposite or for myself they cannot do so because they cannot return to their homes in time. If I had been in the House when the Bill to amend the Dominion Elections Act came up I would have moved this same amendment. I have heard time and again in this House this argument about class legislation. I am sorry to say that whenever we bring a labour measure before the House it is said that it is class legislation. What is there that is not class legislation? Every private Bill is class legislation. Only public Bills are not class legislation, but private members of the House have no chance to put through a Bill during the session because the rules of the House are made to prevent public Bills, introduced by private members, from being passed. The rules are such that you cannot reach a public Bill on the Order Paper. I repeat that private Bills are class legislation, and to facilitate their passage certain days and hours are set apart for them. It is only the Government that can introduce a public Bill and ensure its passing. I know that members on the other side of the House, as well as on this side of the House, are not satisfied with the present conditions because, while a public Bill may be introduced by a private member and placed on the Order Paper, it is wiped off at the end of the session. I claim that my amendment will not prevent the present Bill from passing; far from it. It is just my intention to add to this Bill a certain clause which will enable these railway men to record their votes. It may be said that there are other voters who cannot reach their polling places on election day. It is always possible for men, in the majority of cases, to remain for two or three hours in the city where they reside in order to cast their votes. Commercial travellers can do that. With the railway men it is impossible. Fishermen can go out a little later in the morning or come back a little earlier in the evening, but a train must go on schedule time. The lives of the people are at stake, and there are other considerations which make it necessary that running schedules must be maintained. Let me repeat that it is not my intention to prevent the passing of this measure. I am not afraid of the measure. My only intention is to give these men a chance of casting their votes.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not claim to be any more sincere than the hon. gentleman; so it is evident I did not question his sincerity. I am sorry to hear this legislation spoken of as class legislation. Our soldiers are citizen soldiers, and all classes of people are represented amongst them. I have reason to know that the railway men in particular are represented among our soldiers. They have merged themselves into this great body of men that should not be described as a class in any sense at all. It is composed of people gathered from all ranks and all occupations, and I am sorry to hear this legislation spoken of as class legislation.

Mr. VERVILLE: I only spoke of those who are in Canada.

Mr. DOHERTY: Those in Canada represent all classes. We can hardly speak of them as belonging to any particular class. I do not want to stand on any technical matter at this stage, when a point of order is raised. I am willing to say quite frankly what I think. This Bill was introduced for a specific purpose, and it required to be preceded by a resolution, which resolution could only be presented to this House after it had been communicated to His Royal

Highness the Governor General and had met with his approval. The resolution covered the providing of votes for soldiers. I do not think it would be competent for us to introduce into a Bill of that kind a further extension going beyond what the resolution covers.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me that the Minister of Justice did reflect upon the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville).

Mr. DOHERTY: If I seemed to do it I want amply and completely to withdraw any reflection. I did not intend to make any reflection.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I understood the minister to say was that the amendment was introduced for a purpose.

Mr. DOHERTY: I immediately corrected that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I would understand the minister to mean was that my hon. friend was not sincere in speaking and that he was seeking to introduce this amendment for effect.

Mr. DOHERTY: Just because I had used these words, and because it occurred to me that such a suggestion might come from somebody, I hastened to add that I did not mean to say that there was any such purpose on the part of the hon. gentleman. I hastened to correct myself by saying that there might possibly be a purpose, but I certainly added what I have said, and if I did not I want to do it now. I want to put it as clearly as I can that I did not intend to suggest anything that would lead any one to conclude that I did not attribute perfect sincerity to the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am very glad indeed to hear the minister making that explanation, because I think every member of the community will recognize that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) is at all times earnest, sincere and watchful over the interests of the working people. And, as delegations from the railway men have been before this Government on different occasions urging that better opportunities should be given them for casting their votes, I can very well understand that my hon. friend felt it his duty to avail himself of this opportunity to move the amendment. The Minister of Justice has told the hon. member that it would be better to let this Bill pass as it might help to forward the object he has in view, but it should be borne in mind that the only object of pressing this Bill in the dying hours of this session, and in the face of the many amendments which the Minister of Justice has himself made in it, with a view of removing its defects, is that the Government believes that there may possibly arise before another session of Parliament a psychological moment when they would hope with advantage to throw the country into the turmoil of a general election. Surely it is poor consolation to the railway men to say that the Government may spring an election on them after this Bill is passed, but that next session or the session after, or five years hence, or some time before another general election, the claims of the railway men may be taken up. Call this Bill what you like, it is a Bill to amend the Dominion Elections Act, and it is quite proper that an amendment along the lines suggested by the hon. member should be added to it; the title makes no difference, the title can be changed. My hon. friend (Mr. Verville) only wants provision made so that the railway men may vote at convenient places in Canada under the terms of the present Dominion Elections Act and under the present franchise, and he asks for no important changes at all. On the other hand, this Bill is seeking to make provision for marking ballots in foreign countries under circumstances where it seems impossible to surround the marking of the ballots with the safeguards which the people of Canada have always insisted are to be provided in the case of an election. The Minister of Justice said he was sorry to hear the hon. member refer to some provisions in this Bill as class legislation. I do not understand there is any ignominy attached to the words "class legislation." All that means is, that you are enacting special legislation which will only apply to one particular class of our citizens, and does not this Bill do that? It provides among other things that so far as the soldiers on active service in Canada are concerned there shall be a special franchise for them; that the law requiring a residence of six months or twelve months as is the case in the different provinces shall not apply to the soldiers who are in Canada, but that a residence of thirty days gives them the right to vote. Surely that is legislation applying to a class of our people who have enlisted for active service. There is no insult in the use of the word "class;" all it means is that it applies to a particular

portion of the community, and that is all my hon. friend (Mr. Verville) said. If this Bill is to go through this session, I believe there would be no difficulty at all in having the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Maisonneuve added to it.

We are getting along fairly well with the Bill, and if the Minister of Justice can only come a little way towards us and agree to these reasonable amendments, which would make this Bill workable, and which would surround it with safeguards which would assure an honest vote being taken, we could pass the Bill in a very short time. But if the Minister of Justice shows that he is magnificently stubborn, and that he cannot be made to budge once he makes up his mind, and will not try to improve the Bill unless we all agree to his suggestions, then, of course, it makes it more difficult to consider the measure. Although, of course, at the same time I do not suggest for a moment that the members on this side of the House will not help it along as well as we can.

Mr. CROTHERS: I desire to express my deep sympathy with any practical effort towards securing for railway men an opportunity to exercise the franchise. We have no more intelligent class of voters in Canada than are the railway men, and I would be very glad to do anything I could to bring about a means whereby all railway men would have an opportunity to vote. I have lived for many years in a railway city, and I have regretted at every election to find that large numbers of our very best citizens are deprived of the opportunity of exercising the franchise. In my city we have for thirty years been trying to think out some practical means for securing to the railway men an opportunity to vote, but we have never been able to hit upon a plan that did not seem to have so many objections to it that it was found to be impracticable. I quite admit that the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve would enable a larger percentage of the railway men to vote than is the case now when the election is confined to one day instead of two, but his proposition does not at all meet the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: In my judgment, this discussion is out of order. This amendment is not within the scope of the title of the Bill, and the committee has no power to deal with it nor have a discussion on it on the question under discussion at the present time. Therefore it is my duty, after having consulted my best advisers, to rule the amendment out of order at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Only at the present time?

Will the minister state why the envelopes are to be sent by registered post by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and not by registered post from abroad?

Mr. DOHERTY: The reason why we did not speak of registered post from abroad was that the arrangement with regard to registration on the other side was of such a nature as might expose the ballots to very considerable delay.

Subsection agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER: If I might be permitted, I want to say as regards subsection 4, that it is really a very loose way of handling the ballots that is suggested. The subsection says:

> The envelopes containing the ballot paper shall then and there in the presence of the voter be placed in a bag or other suitable receptacle, which shall be carefully kept by the said officer, and securely closed.

That is the time when the ballot should be placed in a sealed package, the package to be sealed in the presence of the voter and with a notation in some form as to who has voted, so that there will be a permanent record. There is just as great necessity for the ballot to be sealed from the hands of the original returning officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery as there is from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the returning officer in the constituency. I would very strongly urge that my suggestion be adopted.

Mr. DOHERTY: The reason why we use the words "securely closed" instead of the word "sealed," is that it was pointed out to us that in many circumstances it might be difficult or practically impossible for the officer to produce sealing wax to seal up the parcel; after all, sealing is only one method of carefully closing this bag or receptacle, and we are making the requirement that it should be securely closed. If other words can be suggested to be added there that will impress more the necessity of secure closing than the words used, I shall be very glad to add them, but I would like to avoid the word "sealed" simply for the reason I have given. If in addition to "securely closed" we should say "fastened or bound together so that it cannot be opened without that being per-

ceived," or something of that kind, I shall be very glad to add it. I was under the impression that subsection 4 had been passed. I do not want, however, to object to the suggestion of the hon. member.

Mr. OLIVER: I am well aware of that, and I am quite willing to submit to the rule; but I am urging that this is the most important stage in the proceeding, and that there should be a more definite wording. Over and above the sealing of the package, which I still think should be done, the returning officer should make a list of the votes cast and put into the package, so that there will be a permanent record of the votes cast and of the number of the votes cast.

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not think the attention of the minister has been called to the fact that there is no provision in section 2 whereby any soldier who may not be able to read or write will be able to cast his vote. There must be some men in that position, and section 2 is the section that provides the manner of voting.

Mr. GERMAN: The Dominion Elections Act provides for that.

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes, but this is a Bill giving the instructions for the parties who are going to take the vote. Where you have a section like section 2 which deals with the whole voting under these exceptional circumstances, the expression of the method means the exclusion of the more general method contained in the Dominion Elections Act.

I would also like to point out that this section provides for the volunteer who desires to vote:

> In the presence of the said officer, but in such a manner as not to disclose to the officer how he is voting.

I would like to know how this is possible. The Dominion Elections Act provides that a person who wants to mark his ballot shall go into a separate apartment away from the officer and scrutineers and make his mark there, and there is absolute secrecy. There cannot be absolute secrecy here. Fancy the situation in which a vote of this kind will be taken. You have the commanding officer of the company or squadron, as the case may be, in a tent at the front, and you have his table in the centre of the tent. Where is the soldier going to go in that tent for the purpose of marking his ballot so that the officer cannot see what he is doing?

These two points seem to me to be entirely weak. If the wish is to preserve the secrecy of the ballot, you are trying to provide an impossibility, in view of the conditions under which the vote would be taken. In the second place, in my judgment, the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act would not apply to the illiterate voter, for all the directions are contained in the Bill, and this would not be covered without some express declaration.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is a clause in the Bill later on providing that this is to be read—

Mr. MACDONALD: I know that.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not wish to discuss that, but if there be any doubt about the applicability, I am prepared to have the Bill amended so as to expressly declare that section 166 of the Dominion Elections Act shall apply, that being the section applying to those unable to write. Now, with regard to marking the ballot I believe that to require a separate compartment and so on for the marking of the ballot would be to require the impossible. But, for instance, I venture to say, that as the hon. gentleman sits there at his desk, it would be quite possible for him to mark a ballot in such a way that I, standing here, could see him mark it and yet I could not see for which candidate he marked it.

Mr. MACDONALD: This is a very big chamber.

Mr. DOHERTY: And fields are large. I understand that the battle front in Europe extends for miles and miles. If necessary, some of that space could be utilized. I think it is not difficult so to arrange matters so that one can be seen to mark a ballot without it being seen for whom he marks it. I am not now in a position to quote exact instances, but I may say that this is the method provided for in many systems of absentee voting. As to the suggestion of the hon. member for Sunbury and Queens (Mr. H. H. McLean) that a list should be inclosed, I am not going to deny that there would be advantages in having a list made. But we have to remember that if we surround this with too much formality, we shall defeat the very purpose of the measure. After all, the making of the list and inserting it in the package, so far as I can see, would have only this advantage, that if somebody had voted and was entered as one of a certain number on the list and the corresponding ballot did not turn up you would

know that the ballot had disappeared. which would be an indication that the parcel had been tampered with. But this would hardly be conclusive, and you would hardly on that basis, reject all the ballots, for it might be that the failure to put the ballot in was the result of an oversight. When these ballots come to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery he is ordered by the next section to make a record. While there would be usefulness in the list, yet I do not think, in view of the conditions under which this law must be carried out, that we ought to impose more formalities than are absolutely necessary.

Referring to the observations of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), if we might be allowed to go back to subsection 4, I would like to have it amended in the sense he suggested. I move:

That subsection 4 be reconsidered, and that it be amended by adding, in line thirty-five, after the word "closed," the words "and fastened in such a manner as to make any tampering with the same evident.'

Mr. NESBITT: Is not the minister providing for a list?

Mr. DOHERTY: I pointed out that the advantage of having a list, in my opinion, would not counterbalance the disadvantage of the additional formality.

Mr. NESBITT: It would be a check on the officer himself. It would be no trouble for him to count the number of ballots.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman means to enter only the number, not the names?

Mr. NESBITT: Only the number of the names or envelopes.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no objection to requiring him to enclose a statement of the number of ballots, in the parcel.

Mr. NESBITT: That would be a certain check.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DOHERTY: Now, to provide for the statement of the number of envelopes, I move:

That the section be amended by adding, at the end of line thirty-four, after the word "receptacle,' the words, "in which the officer shall enclose a slip giving the number of envelopes contained in it."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MACDONALD: If any special place is provided for the voting of the soldiers at the front, in all probability it will be a tent.

[Mr. Doherty.]

I am quite sure that you cannot work out the idea of secrecy in connection with the marking of the ballot if the soldier has to mark it in the presence of an officer. Why should he mark it in the presence of an officer, if he knows how to read and write? I suggest that words "in the presence of the said officer" be struck out from the fourth line of subsection 4.

Mr. DOHERTY: No man gets a ballot until he makes an affidavit. We thought to secure that the man himself shall mark the ballot. If we allow him to go away from the presence of the officer to mark his ballot, we do not know who will mark that ballot. It is suggested to me by my colleague (Mr. Crothers) that after the word "officer" in line 26 of subsection 4, there be inserted the words "or any other person." I beg to move that subsection 4 be so amended.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GERMAN: In every election there are independent candidates in many constituencies. The Government may have a candidate in a certain constituency, and the Opposition, feeling that they cannot carry the constituency, do not put up a candidate; accordingly, an independent candidate offers for election. On the other hand, in some constituency which is very strongly Liberal, the Government may not put up a candidate, and the result will be that there will be an Opposition candidate and an independent candidate. How will the votes be counted in such cases? If the soldiers vote for the Government, and there is no Government candidate, how will the votes be dealt with? One of the very many exceedingly objectionable features which I see in this Bill is that the voters at the front do not know who the candidates are.

Mr. CROTHERS: Does the hon. member offer any suggestion to obviate that difficulty?

Mr. GERMAN: The first suggestion I offer—and I think it is an exceedingly sensible suggestion—is that the Bill be dropped. The second suggestion that I offer is that you do away altogether with the mention of the independent candidate. I simply wish to point out that the soldiers may vote for a Government candidate or an Opposition candidate, and there may be no Government candidate or no Opposition candidate.

Mr. DOHERTY: As to the suggestion that we drop the Bill, of course I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in that respect. If a man votes for the Government candidate

in a particular constituency and there is nobody supporting the Government, that man is in the same position as anybody who votes at home for a person who is not a candidate—he loses his vote. The same thing applies, of course, if he votes for an Opposition candidate or an independent candidate, and there happens not to be any. Speaking personally, I have a strong feeling that the opportunity that is now afforded to the voter to say: I vote for John Smith—naming the candidate—will meet a great many cases. I believe that the knowledge will reach the other side in a great many instances as to who the candidates are or will be, and that this knowledge will enable the soldiers to take the chance in registering their votes, that a certain man is going to be a candidate. I think many ballots will come back containing ballots for particular candidates, and I think that in the bulk of cases it will turn out that the person named on the ballot is the real candidate. I am free to admit that there may be cases where a soldier says: I vote for the independent candidate, and there may turn out to be no independent candidate; also there may be cases where a man may vote for the Government or for the Opposition candidate and there may be no such candidate. These will be exceptional cases, however; I confess that I cannot devise means to avoid that.

Mr. GERMAN: They may be exceptional, but they may not be so exceptional in this case as not to affect the whole result of the election. Sometimes majorities are very narrow.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: These cases were not exceptional in the province of Quebec during the last election. At that election there were fifty candidates whose platform was opposed to the policies of both the leader of the Government and of the Opposition. They most emphatically disowned any relationship with the present Prime Minister, and one sentence that is well remembered in my province was, Borden is worse than Laurier.

Mr. DOHERTY: That was awfully abusive.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was well known that most of these gentlemen were Conservatives, and it is well known now that their campaign fund was financed by the Conservative party. I have under my hand the programme of one of these gentlemen, Mr. L. P. Pelletier, now Judge Pelletier, who was the former Postmaster General in this Administration. This is what he said in his speech at Jeune Lorette in accepting the candidature. I am quoting from L'Evenement, the organ of the Conservative party, in its issue of August 30, 1911:

"En second lieu je suis candidat parce qu'à votre voix qui m'appelait s'est jointe la voix du chef nationaliste de ce district, M. Armand Lavergne."

"Je suis aussi candidat comme protestation contre la marine de guerre, et pour contribuer à rémédier à cette loi scélérate."

I will try to translate that: Certainly I am a candidate because to your voice—the voice of the people—which is calling me, is united the voice of the Nationalist leader of this district, Mr. Armand Lavergne. I am also a candidate as a protest against the Naval Law, and to help in having that nefarious law repealed.

Surely the Minister of Justice will not say that Mr. Pelletier was an Independent; for, thirty days after he uttered these words, he was a member of this Administration.

Mr. DOHERTY: He might meet the description of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). He was clearly against the Government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He was not an Independent at all, for he became a member of this Administration thirty days after. I should like to know what the returning officer would do in such a case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Put him on the bench.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Would he count the votes in favour of the Government? Perhaps under one of the artful clauses of this Bill the right hon. Prime Minister would be the judge. Is that fair? I do not think so. The right hon. gentleman knows by experience what the independence of the so-called Nationalists amounts to. It would be deceiving the electors to call these men Independents. I am sure that at the last election it would have been very difficult to apply this system in my riding; it would have been very difficult to say to whom the vote should go. I do not know whether there will be any Nationalists next time, I do not think there are many of them left in the province of Quebec. I think provision should be made in the Bill to cover such a case as I have mentioned. Personally I do not see how this Bill can be worked out.

10 p.m.

Mr. DOHERTY: I appreciate the kindly anxiety of the hon. gentleman on behalf of the Nationalists, of whom he says there are no more. We are legislating for the present and the future, not for past conditions. In any event the only ballots that the leader of the Government or the leader of the Opposition can deal with are those that have been given either for the Government or for the Opposition. Their respective power is limited to saying who ought to get that vote, the Prime Minister dealing with votes marked for the Government, and the leader of the Opposition dealing with votes marked for the Opposition. The men who vote will make it quite clear that they want their vote to go to the greatest benefit for the Government or for the Opposition, and I think we have provided a perfectly fair method of determining who that vote for the Government shall be applied to, or who that vote for the Opposition shall be applied to. As for the Independent candidate, in no case will the leader of the Government or the leader of the Opposition be entitled to claim votes given for Independent candidates. Either there will be a person to answer to that description or there will not. If there is such a person he will get the votes. If there is not, the vote will be void.

Mr. MARCIL: Suppose there are two independent candidates.

Mr. DOHERTY: If there are, I do not know how you are going to arrive at a determination as between them. But all our past experience goes to show while such a case is possible, it is very exceptional.

Mr. MARCIL: I think the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) always runs as an independent candidate.

Mr. DOHERTY: He will get the votes, then.

Mr. MARCIL: Suppose the votes are all marked either for the Government or for the Opposition. The hon. member for South York would not get any of the Government votes, as he would not be a Government candidate.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member for South York is not here to define his exact situation, and I do not think I am called upon to do it.

Mr. VERVILLE: Suppose that a great number of ballots are marked Independent, and that there is no Independent candidate in that division. Those ballots would not be counted. Is that fair? We are so anxious to give the soldiers an opportunity to vote that we should certainly see that their votes are not lost. Again, a candidate may accept the fiscal policy of a certain party, but be against that party on other questions. Suppose that in his speeches he lets the people know where he stands, where would those ballots go? It is such a technical question that perhaps only a lawyer could decide it. Perhaps it would be better to divide the votes, seeing that the candidate favoured one part of the policy of his leader, but not another part. I suppose my hon. friend would say that those votes would be rejected. As we are so anxious to give votes to the soldiers, we should see that the votes are not thrown away. My hon. friend said that there will be Liberal candidates at the next election. I hope there will be quite a few of them. There may also be some Socialist candidates; I think there will. They might be elected but you could not be sure. It would be a good thing to have a few of them in this House. Will one mark "socialist" on his ballot if there is no socialist or candidate of an independent turn of mind? It has been the custom of many people in this country to mark "socialist" on their ballots and thus spoil their ballots because they want to acknowledge the fact that they are for socialism. The more we study this Bill the more we see its defects. I would be sorry to think that any soldiers should lose their votes on this account. Canadian soldiers have probably learned more of socialism than they ever knew before. They are now in contact with elements which probably were not so familiar to them on this side and it may be that a great many of these men will be willing to cast their votes for socialists. There are many socialists in Belgium, England, and France, they will be associating with those who hold these ideas at the front and they also may come in contact with German prisoners who are socialists. Therefore, there may be a very great change of opinion and I am afraid that a large number of votes will be spoiled in that way.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know that my position enables me to give any authoritative solution of the difficulty suggested. But I would take it that if you had in a constituency a Government candidate, an Opposition candidate and, say, a socialist candidate, and you had votes given for an independent candidate, I would understand that under these circumstances the man who classified himself as a socialist, or came

under some other designation would thereby announce himself neither as supporting the Government nor the Opposition, and would meet the description of an independent candidate. But it will not do for me to deal with that. If that question arises the courts will have to determine it. We have provided for people as being for the Government, for the Opposition, or for neither one nor the other and I would be disposed to think that any man who adopted a designation such as the hon. gentleman suggests would be starting out on a line which would place him in the position of being neither for the Government nor the Opposition. That, to my mind, would meet the description of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PROULX: In the case of a deferred election both might be for the Government.

Mr. DOHERTY: The gentlemen will vote either for the Government or the Opposition. If they vote for the Opposition, and both of the candidates are for the Government, they will be in the position of having voted for no candidate if it turns out that that is the situation.

Mr. TURGEON: I have always been opposed to electors being called upon to vote for anything but a personality. If they are asked to vote for the Government or the Opposition there is intimidation. When the officer confronts the voter and asks him if he votes for or against the Government it is certainly intimidation especially in the case of the soldier at the front. No one in this country values more highly the sacrifices which our soldiers are making than I do. I value so much the sacrifices of our soldiers and I would think they had so much to do in this terrible war, the results of which must certainly be disastrous to our children at the front, that I would not even attempt to bring in a bill to give franchise to the soldiers until the time when they had returned from the front bearing the laurels of victory. We all expect and hope that this terrible war will be ended favourably to the cause of the Allies before next September or October. It has been a very strenuous war but the most terrible part of it is to come because the Allies are bound to conquer, as they must conquer in the interest of humanity. I would like to ask any hon. members of this House why we should be rushing on an election during the most terrible part of this war. Lord Kitchener told us not six weeks ago that the war would commence in May. It is about commencing now, and the sacrifices that our armies have made during the last five or six months are nothing as compared with the sacrifices which they will be called upon to bear within the next six months. The only encouragement that the soldier has in the trenches is that derived from the comradeship of the man who is beside him. He does not inquire whether he is a Liberal or Conservative, whether he is for the Government or for the Opposition, he knows that he will help to sustain his life and courage in the great struggle that is being waged in the cause of humanity. That is the situation, and unless we can draw up a Bill which will give the franchise in such a form as we all desire, such as will enable the soldier to cast an independent vote, we should not be too eager to expedite this measure. During the discussion this afternoon and this evening the Minister of Justice by his avowals has admitted the impossibility of framing a Bill which will meet all the requirements of the men at the front. I am for votes for the soldiers, but why not wait until another session? We have supplied the Government with all the money they need to carry on the war. We look for British examples. Next December the British Parliament will expire. Is the British Parliament busy to-day passing a Bill providing votes for the soldiers at the front? It is contemplating the possibility of extending the life of Parliament in order that there may be no election during the war. We have eighteen months yet to go, and I am sure that in that eighteen months the war will be settled satisfactorily to the Allies, or it will never be settled. The discussion having demonstrated the impracticability of the Bill which we have before us, let us consider it for another year and if the war is not settled by that time the Bill can be taken up again and brought into operation at the expiration of this Parliament, which will take place in November, 1916. I submit these considerations to the Minister of Justice and I appeal to his judgment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the Bill a provision to meet the case of a soldier who through the action of the enemy has lost the use of his arms, or is invalided in some way so that he cannot sign the ballot paper?

Mr. DOHERTY: That suggestion was made by the hon. member for Pictou and I answered that section 166 of the Dominion Elections Act, which deals with persons who are physically unable to mark the

ballot paper, would be made to apply to this Act.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the words "I vote" on the ballot papers be in French and English?

Mr. DOHERTY: I will be very glad to put them both in French and in English.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I suppose some of the affidavits should be in French?

Mr. DOHERTY: We could have some printed in French and some in English.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the ballot bear the initials of the officer who takes the vote?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no provision for that but if it is considered a precaution I have no objection to insert it. We were relying on the fact that the officer saw the man mark the actual ballot. In view of the circumstances under which this vote is to be taken I would like to avoid introducing any complication unless it is of manifest advantage.

What we did rely upon in that regard as to the identity of the ballot was the fact that the officer would see that the whole thing was done simultaneously, and that he was in a position to see the marking of the ballot. Then the ballot as it stands in the form provided in the Bill will have the counterfoil with the number on it which will remain on the stub as it is handed out, and it seems to me that that is sufficient identification that it is the same ballot, because the man does his voting without leaving the sight of the officer. I would like to avoid complicating the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is no evidence that the same ballot will get back to Canada.

Mr. DOHERTY: Would the initials of the returning officer be sufficient?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think the initials would be of much use being put on abroad, because if any one wanted to switch the ballot, he could do it.

Mr. NESBITT: He could initial the envelope as being closed.

Mr. OLIVER: There is a general provision that if a ballot has a special mark,, it loses its value. Under the circumstances in which the ballots are to be marked, there is a very great possibility that there may be marking that will tend to disclose identity, or that will not be in accordance with the ordinary usage.

It would be very undesirable if the very strict rule that is generally applied to the marking of ballots in their being counted were applied to the making of these ballots. Will that strict rule be applied under the provisions of this Bill to these ballots?

Mr. DOHERTY: That is the rule that provides that if a ballot is marked so that it can be identified, it loses its value?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY: If I understand the matter aright, in the application of this section, it becomes a question to be determined by the circumstances of each particular marking, whether a mark in a certain way is a mark by which a man can be identified. While I have not had occasion very recently to look into the jurisprudence in connection with the subject, I do not think I am wrong in saying that the courts have adopted pretty generally the rule that you should lean in favour of the view that will give effect to the vote. I have no doubt that the courts in determining whether a mark, that may be claimed to be a marking that may serve to identify, should be so considered or not, will take into consideration the circumstances under which the ballot is marked. It would not be safe for us to wipe out the provision entirely; the safest course is to leave to the good judgment of the courts to bear in mind the circumstances in which the ballots are marked when determining whether the particular way in which the ballot is marked will lead to the identity of the voter.

Mr. OLIVER: These ballots will count as much as any other ballot, and sometimes an election turns on the marking of one or two ballots. Therefore you cannot give too great care to determining what shall and what shall not be counted.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have an amendment which I would like to suggest to my hon. friend to come as subsection 11 of section 2 which we have been considering. Before reading the proposed amendment, I would like to call the attention of the minister to the fact—and to emphasise it as strongly as possible—that Parliament is proposing to ask officers of the Imperial Army to perform certain duties under this legislation. These officers are all under the control of the British War Office, and of course their military duty is the paramount duty which they are called upon to perform. Therefore

I would suggest to the minister that it would be an act of courtesy; that it would lead to greater harmony in the discharge of their duties by the different officers and to better understanding with the War Office, and that it would be altogether exceedingly desirable that before we give effect to the provisions of this Bill seeking to impose these duties upon Imperial officers over whom this Government has no control, the Secretary of State for War should be consulted and his approval of the Bill obtained. I throw out this suggestion which I think is worthy of favourable consideration, and it is altogether desirable that it should be added to the Bill. The amendment which I would suggest is:

That there be added as subsection 11 of section 2 the words:

No action shall be taken under the foregoing provisions of this section until the same have been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State for War of the United Kingdom.

Mr. DOHERTY: This suggestion, perhaps not precisely in this form but in substance, has been made at different times throughout this debate. For myself, I think it so perfectly obvious that neither the Secretary of State for War on the other side nor any member of the Imperial Government, nor any authority whatsoever over there, would ever imagine that we meant to force the operation of this law to the detriment of military operations or so as to interfere with anything that the military authorities could consider necessary, that it would be absolutely out of place that we should put in this Bill something that would suggest that we thought that they might think us endeavouring to do that. I am quite confident that they would never think so. That being so with regard to this particular case, I think generally speaking, it is a highly objectionable proposition that this Parliament should legislate subject to the permission of the Secretary of State for War or of any other minister of His Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom. I would like to point out what I said in moving the second reading of this Bill, that to my mind this is purely a Bill recognizing the right to the franchise of a certain class of Canadian subjects of the King and providing a method whereby they may exercise that franchise. It is absolutely without question that where availing themselves of that right will interfere in any way with the paramount duty of those Canadian subjects of the King as soldiers of the King, they themselves will not allow it to interfere, and that if they were disposed to do so, the military authorities can be absolutely trusted not to allow it to interfere. That is a matter which the military authorities are absolutely in a position to control; but for my part, and with all the respect that I entertain for the military authorities of the United Kingdom and for His Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom, I, as one member of the Parliament of Canada and as one representative of the people of Canada, certainly do not think that it would be the proper thing that we should legislate as to who in Canada should have the franchise and who in Canada should be afforded the means of exercising that right, and say in express terms that we subject our judgment upon that question either to the Secretary of State for War or to His Majesty's Government as a whole of the United Kingdom. I do think we owe that much recognition to the autonomy of this country, that much respect to this Parliament itself. So completely is it recognized that the power relating to the election of representatives of the people in this country belongs exclusively to the Parliament of Canada and to the courts that the Parliament of Canada constitutes, that His Majesty's Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have consistently declined to entertain applications for leave to appeal in cases bearing upon elections to this House, laying down the doctrine that it was within Canada that matters pertaining to the election of members to the House of Commons of Canada should properly be decided. It therefore appears to me obviously unnecessary that we should go forward implying in any way to the Secretary of War that we have the faintest idea that our legislation can under any circumstances interfere with his military control of military operations. In the second place, I think it, in principle, undesirable in the strongest sense of that word, that we should in an Act dealing with the Canadian franchise, subject the action of this House to any approval or disapproval outside of this Parliament of Canada. Therefore, I must, for my part, decline to accept the suggested amendment. I may point out, if it is thought that in doing what we are doing here to-night we are overstepping the proper bounds within which the Parliament of Canada should keep itself, that there is in His Majesty a power of disallowance. But I do not think we can go forward with the implied admission that there is something in our legislation which could be objectionable. For my part, I see nothing to give rise to

any well-founded objection on the part of the Secretary of State for War or the Government of the United Kingdom, and I am not ready to go forward with the suggestion, which would be involved in our submitting the legislation to the approbation of this minister, that there is something objectionable in this Bill. An hon. gentleman said to me to-day, "Qui s'excuse, s'accuse". If we go with such excuses we imply that there is lurking in our minds the belief that we have tried to do something which might interfere with the legitimate authority of the Secretary of State for War. I have no consciousness of having done anything of that kind, and the legislation we are dealing with to-night seems to me so obviously and in a very special manner a matter to be dealt with exclusively by this Parliament that I cannot consent that legislation being subjected to the approval of any Minister of the Crown in the United Kingdom.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. minister has entirely misunderstood the amendment I have proposed. I was careful that it should have no reference whatever to section 1, which is the section which establishes the franchise and gives the vote to soldiers on active service, subject only to their having had a residence of thirty days in this country. As to that, I raise no question by my amendment. But section 2 provides the machinery by which the soldiers are to be permitted to exercise this right, and the minister proposes by the various subsections of this section to exact an obligation from, and impose a duty upon, officers of the Imperial Government, officers who are in the Imperial army. Without a "by your leave" or suggesting that we do him the courtesy to ask the consent of the Secretary for War, we will impose on these officers, who are abroad for military duty and in the interest of the Empire, and under the absolute control of the Imperial Government, the duty of carrying out the provisions of this Act. And the minister says that, because I proposed that before exacting this obligation from these officers the Secretary of State for War shall be consulted and shall approve of it, I am in some way humiliating this Parliament, and suggesting that by possibility the Secretary of State for War may not approve of it. Surely the minister must be wrong. All I say by my amendment and my argument is that we are asking these British officers to do what we have no right to ask them to do. We are by statute imposing upon them an obligation which we have no earthly right to impose on them. We are saying by our proposed statute that, instead of appointing our own electoral officers and sending them abroad to give to our soldiers the right to exercise their franchise, we will impose this obligation upon an Imperial officer. Is it humiliating to this Parliament—Does it detract from the authority of this Parliament if we say that, before so imposing this obligation upon these Imperial officers, the Secretary of State for War shall be consulted and shall give his consent?—not to the whole Bill, not to that part which extends the franchise, but only to that part which imposes these obligations upon the officers of the Imperial service. Is it detracting from the dignity of this Parliament if I say that before doing that the Secretary for War shall be consulted and shall approve of it? My mind may be different from that of the minister, but to me it seems cheeky and absolutely indefensible for this Parliament to declare by law that this task shall be cast upon the Imperial officers who are at the front to do Imperial duty, without asking the consent of the Secretary of State for War under whom they are serving. I cannot but express extreme surprise that my hon. friend regards this amendment unfavourably. I can do nothing further now, but I can say that when the Bill comes up for third reading, I shall have an opportunity of presenting my amendment again.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman's amendment is to the effect that this Bill shall not come into operation—

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, only section 2.

Mr. DOHERTY: Then, we are reduced to the operation of section 2. It is so perfectly obvious that these operations will not interfere with any matter which is properly within the authority of the Secretary of State for War that, for my part, I do not see why the suggestion should be made that they will do so. During something over an hour this evening I was condemned very forcefully, and with a great deal of eloquence and sincerity, by the hon. member for Edmonton and the hon. member for St. John city because I was neither imposing nor could impose any obligation on these officers of the British army. Now I am being condemned because I am imposing an obligation upon the officers of the British army without consulting the Secretary of State for War. I wonder what is the

real opinion of the hon. member for St. John city with regard to what I am doing. I was wrong a while ago because I was not imposing and could not impose an obligation on these officers, and I ought to get a commission of people who, this Government not being able to do so, would go over there and impose obligations upon the officers of the British army. That was the head and front of my offending then. Now—I do not know whether this is the other end of my offending—my offending is that I am imposing obligations upon these officers without the consent of the Secretary of State for War. I do not know whether anything will be gained by my repeating it, but it is so perfectly clear that nothing in this Bill is an obligation that can in the slightest degree come into conflict with the authority of the Secretary of State for War that I entirely fail to see the utility of this proviso. I quite understand that, thinking that we are doing something which involves an infringement upon the rights and jurisdiction of the Secretary of State for War—something which they describe as "cheeky" —hon. gentlemen express the view that we ought to put this proviso in. I fail, however, to see the necessity for it. Even though we limit it only to the operation of section 2, it would be unfortunate to introduce into our legislation anything that would be susceptible of being interpreted as implying that we are legislating subject to the consent of a Minister of the Crown of the United Kingdom.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to correct the minister so far as my attitude was concerned. I do not recall that I was condemning him.

Mr. DOHERTY: I mean to say, condemning my course.

Mr. OLIVER: If I may be permitted, I do not even agree to that. All I wanted was to establish a fact as it existed, and then to draw certain conclusions from that fact. I do not wish to be understood as condemning either the minister or his course; all I wanted was to know exactly what the course was, and what the consequences of it would be. At this moment I am not going to concern myself with the constitutional side of this question or the maintenance of the dignity of Parliament, but I am still concerned as to the probability of the volnteers overseas exercising the privilege or the right which it is proposed that they shall have an opportunity of exercising. It must be obvious that it is a matter of interest to us, if we are desirous of their exercising the right that we place within their reach, to know whether the authorities that are supreme on that side of the water are willing that they should exercise that right. It is obvious, too, that if the authorities there are not willing, the volunteers are certainly not going to be able to exercise it. On the other hand, if the authorities are willing, the exercise of the right by the soldiers then depends, as I have said, on the whim of the officers. I do not wish to criticise unduly, but I would have thought that it would have been wise for the Government to become informed as to what the view of the British military authorities is in regard to the application of this provision. They have not seen fit to do so, however; we are passing the legislation, and there is no time to find out now. It seems to me that it is a fair proposition that a saving clause should be inserted in the Bill such as has been suggested by the hon. member for the City of St. John.

Mr. MACDONALD: The proposal made by the hon .member for St. John city is so obviously proper and right that I cannot understand the position taken by the Minister of Justice in regard to it. What did we send these men across the ocean for? We sent them across the ocean to place them at the disposal of King George and his Imperial officers, headed by the Secretary of State for War, to fight the battles of the Empire. That is their first duty; that is their whole duty; that is that duty the fulfilment of which with credit to themselves will cause us to give them the glory of victory when they return. The moment they landed on the soil of Great Britain they ceased to be under the supervision of the Government of Canada, except in the matter of receiving their pay. As to their disposition; as to where they shall go and what they shall do; as to how they shall perform their duties—that is under the direction of Lord Kitchener, and no one else. The Secretary of State for War having control of their movements for the purpose of defending the Empire and of attacking the Germans, I agree with the hon. member for St. John that it is cheeky and impertinent for us to attempt to interfere with his direction and authority by saying that his commanding officers and captains shall do this, that or the other thing on a particular day or days when he, perchance, may wish them to be doing something else. I think also that the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John that the Minister of Militia should have

been here during the discussion of this Bill is very apt. The Minister of Justice, erudite lawyer that he is, has no special acquaintance with military discipline, military law or military operations.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He was a soldier.

Mr. MACDONALD: He is an honorary colonel, like myself.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am a real captain, unlike yourself.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Minister of Justice will hardly claim that the situation just now with regard to military operations is such that any one on this side of the ocean is possessed of knowledge which would enable him to take any action interfering with the authority and direction of Lord Kitchener in the controlling of the movements of the men under his supervision. When in the committee I ventured to make a suggestion as to what should be done, my hon. friend took the ground at that time that you could not dictate to these men, that it was a matter entirely for the commanding officer to say whether he would do this or that. When some one suggested that the commanding officer should make out a list of the men who came before him to vote, my hon. friend took the ground that we ought not to impose on the officers in that way. All through the discussion my hon. friend recognized the fact that he had no control or authority over these men, and that he could not interfere with them. If that is so, who has the control of them? The Secretary of War, unquestionably. What is the use of us keeping this House sitting day after day in order to pass legistion which will be inoperative, absolutely a dead letter, if Lord Kitchener, in view of the issues that are at stake, should take it into his head to say: I am not going to let my commanding officers waste a week or ten days running around picking up votes from the men who ought to be getting ready to fight the Germans. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), that we should say that this legislation is subject to the approval of the man who has control of the commanding officers, is but due recognition by the Canadian Parliament of the fact that our soldiers are under the control of Great Britain. There is no divided authority in this matter. A lot of confusion seems to exist in the public mind; some people think that the Canadian Government have got some kind of a string on our soldiers who have gone to the front. Why, every man that signed the muster roll agreed to serve the Empire for three years, and to give his services not to the Canadian Government but to King George, and to obey the Imperial authorities. This legislation practically amounts to saying to our soldiers: You shall not go out and fight; you and your commanding officers must give up your training in England for this war, and turn out for a week or ten days to see whether you cannot get in some votes. I say that any measure of this kind which did not contain in it the stipulation that the consent of Lord Kitchener should be obtained before it became operative would be not merely cheek and impertinence, but an insult to Lord Kitchener as well. That is the situation; and to talk of autonomy under these circumstances only shows that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have forgotten that there is a war going on; otherwise, they would never have proposed this legislation.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman has been impressing upon us things that are so absolutely obvious that it would be absurd for us to make a provision in regard to them, as though we did not know that they were perfectly obvious. This law cannot interfere with the military authority of Lord Kitchener.

Mr. MARCIL: Because Kitchener will not allow it to interfere.

Mr. DOHERTY: And it does not pretend to. We simply assume that Lord Kitchener gives us credit for common sense; and we further assume that Lord Kitchener, having at least as much knowledge with regard to military matters, well, perhaps not quite the degree of knowledge of my 11 p.m. distinguished friend and cohonorary colonel the hon. member for Pictou, will look upon this matter with common sense; and so we leave it in his hands with absolute confidence that he will see to it that if anything under this Act interferes with the performance of military duty it shall not be done.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why do you not say so?

Mr. DOHERTY: Because it is so entirely unnecessary to say so; because the Act as it stands, without those words, is neither intended to interfere nor can it interfere with the authority of Lord Kitchener; and because I think it would be an unfortunate thing for us to intimate that we were passing legislation that would so interfere with this great work as to make it necessary for

us to first ask his leave. As I have said several times in the course of this discussion we are perfectly willing, if need be, that the Act should lie there a dead letter, rather than that there should be interference with the paramount duty of the soldier. Just let me point out the degree to which the hon. member for Pictou has found it necessary to read into this Bill things that are not in it. He tells this House that in this Bill there is said to the officers of Canada; "You shall not go out to fight; you shall take ten days for running around to pick up votes." When I propose a Bill of that kind I shall recognize that I am proposing something so utterly and entirely indefensible that I cannot conceive of any man being so cheeky and so impertinent as to do what the hon. gentleman suggests, namely, that we should present ourselves to Lord Kitchener and say: My dear Lord Kitchener, we are passing a law saying to your soldiers, you shall give up your fighting, you shall abandon your military duties and take a week or ten days off for the purpose of running around and picking up votes; and we have come, Lord Kitchener, to ask your leave to pass that law. Could anything be more offensive to Lord Kitchener than that anybody should suggest that he could possibly give leave for that kind of legislation? If I ever dreamed of proposing legislation of that kind I certainly should not like to be the gentleman delegated to ask Lord Kitchener's leave to give effect to it. This legislation proposes nothing of that kind. It is purely enabling legislation making it possible for the soldiers to vote, subject of course to the performance of their military duties; and I think it would be as offensive to our soldiers for us to suggest that they were willing to abandon their duties in order to pick up votes as it would be to suggest to Lord Kitchener that we thought it possible that he would give us leave to have legislation of that sort made operative. The moment the operation of this legislation runs counter to the performance of the military duties of the soldiers, automatically it ceases to have operation.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend is arguing in a kind of a circle. He says that this legislation will be inoperative unless Lord Kitchener consents, and yet he says that this legislation is only for the purpose of enabling the soldiers to vote. Why, those soldiers can vote only if Lord Kitchener lets them. When we suggest a provision that the Bill shall not become operative unless Lord Kitchener consents to it, my hon. friend argues that the autonomy of Canada is in peril. Now what sense is there in passing legislation for the purpose of enabling men who are on active service to vote, unless Lord Kitchener gives his consent to it? It is no use our fooling away time here passing legislation which is not to be operative.

Mr. DOHERTY: Why do you do it?

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman knows that the session came to a conclusion naturally a few days ago. The hon. gentleman knows that he never could draft a Bill to provide in any practical way for the soldiers on active service casting their votes. For what reason, in process of time, have we had this measure evolved? My hon. friend does not meet this issue at all by saying what he does say in answer to the objection. It is held up to the country that they are proposing a method by which the soldiers can vote. Either the measure is a successful and practical one, and one under which the soldiers can vote, or it is not. My hon. friend says to-night that it is not a practical measure, that it is not one under which a man can vote, that it is an enabling measure only if Lord Kitchener chooses to call a halt to operations so that under section 2 some of these men can vote. I would like to know what my hon. friend does say if he does not say that.

Mr. DOHERTY: I said that if it does not interfere with the performance of any military duty nobody will interfere to prevent it taking effect. It does not interfere in any of its provisions with the performance of military duties.

Mr. MACDONALD: It does interfere. Every line of section 2 interferes with the performance of some duty by the commanding officers of the army whose business it is to fight the Germans. Otherwise all of this section 2 is nonsense. If this section does not mean that the commanding officers are going to take some time to do this work correctly, and if these officers are not to be diverted from their duty preparing for and taking this vote, I do not know what this measure means. It is an enabling measure, says my hon. friend; it is not compulsory. That means that if any one of these officers attached to the Canadian contingent chooses to say: I do not want to take the votes of my men and I am not going to do it, that you are not going to have the

votes of that branch of the service taken at all. Then there is this further consideration. General orders are issued either in England, Bermuda or France, providing that various duties shall be undertaken by the commanding officer. Except in times of extraordinary emergency these general orders are always issued a couple of days before the actual performance of the duty assigned to the officer, and it may be that an officer's time is fully taken up in pursuance of one of these general orders. Under the circumstances must he disregard the general orders and pay attention to an Act of the Canadian Parliament? Are these officers going to pay attention to the orders of General Alderson or are they going to pay attention to an Act of this Parliament? My hon. friend says that they will pay attention to the orders of General Alderson. The result is that this measure is of no use unless his superior officer, his commander, and the Secretary of State for War, definitely intimate to Gen. Alderson that it is his duty to see that sufficient time is allowed on various days for the taking of this vote. Unless this legislation is to be subject to the direction of General Kitchener it is mere waste paper. We are wasting time talking about it. The position of the Minister of Justice indicates that. That being so, is it not ordinary politeness to say to Lord Kitchener, the man to whom the whole Emipre looks, and who has the responsibility of seing us through this war: Having control over our troops at the front, is it possible for you to arrange for them to vote under the proper method? That being the fact, we should say so and it should be put in the Act .

Mr. MARCIL: I have every respect for the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), but I am sorry to see that the position he takes to-night is not one in keeping with the general attitude of the Government. From the very outbreak of the war we were told in all the declarations of the Prime Minister and of his colleagues that the Government, in connection with every move that was being taken, were in close consultation with the home Government. It was stated that nothing was done unless the War Office was consulted. Yet the minister has declared to-night that the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) places us in a position of inferiority in such a way that it would make us subservient to the wishes of a minister in Great Britain in the exercise of what the hon. gentleman considers to be a free right of the Canadian Government—the granting of the franchise to whomsoever it pleases. It is a long time since Downing street rule has been battered out of Canada and there is no intention of reviving it, but at the present time every move in our war policy is subservient to the wishes of the Imperial Government. It could not be otherwise. The only way in which we can take an active part in this great war is by co-operating with the British authorities. Instead of passing a measure which would be accepted unanimously by the Canadian Parliament and the people, we find that we have only a measure which has been tattered and torn, which has been amended in every respect, and which is going out of this House in such a condition as to threaten it with falling into contempt because it cannot be enforced. A law which cannot be enforced, a law which is allowed to fall into contempt, is of no advantage to the public or to the people for whose benefit it was especially intended. I think the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from St. John is elementary and should be accepted by the Government. In order to make sure that the soldiers on the other side will really have a chance of casting their votes the Government should neglect no opportunity, they should do everything that is possible to be done to show their sincerity in the matter and to make it certain that this Act shall not become a dead letter. I regret that the minister has not accepted this amendment and I hope that before the Bill reaches the stage for its third reading better counsels will have prevailed, and that it will be accepted, if only in the interest of the soldiers themselves. The Government have assured us that they are very anxious that the Canadian soldiers shall have an opportunity of casting their votes but inasmuch as they have neglected to enter into communication with the War Office through the proper channels the right of our Canadian soldiers to exercise the franchise may be placed in jeopardy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to express my opinion of the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I am glad to know that the Minister of Justice is a convert to Canadian autonomy.

Mr. DOHERTY: A convert?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Unfortunately his plea for Canadian autonomy does not work in with this proposed legislation. If the Canadian soldiers were acting under the Canadian Militia Act I would understand

the plea of my hon. friend, but we have given all that away by allowing our volunteers to go beyond the boundaries of our country and serve in the Imperial army. I am in favour of giving votes to our soldiers if we can provide proper machinery for them to exercise the franchise. The moment our soldiers leave the shores of Canada, they are under British Army regulations. Their prime duty is to fight for the liberties of the British Empire, and the Canadian Government cannot impose any other duty on them without first obtaining the sanction of the British military authorities. Not only must we require the goodwill of Lord Kitchener to carry out the provisions of this Bill, but Lord Kitchener himself may have to consult the officers commanding the Canadian troops, and possibly also the French and Belgian generals with whose armies the Canadian soldiers may at the time be intermingled. It is quite possible that General Alderson or Sir John French may have to consult General Joffre and other French generals, operating in northern France or in Belgium, where the Canadian soldiers may be. The Minister of Justice shakes his head, but he has served with honour in the North-West rebellion and knows what military discipline is, for both officers and men. Will he tell me that when a regiment is in action any outside civil authority, no matter how high, can interfere with the direction of the commanding officer? The Minister of Justice will not deny that proposition.

Mr. DOHERTY: I certainly will not deny it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Then, the hon. gentleman should not hazard passing this legislation without having first obtained the sanction and goodwill of the British War Office. Should this Bill become law, it is quite possible that some officers will agree that the soldiers may vote, while others may be opposed to it, and may answer that having received no orders from the War Office they shall not allow their men to play politics when the fate of the Empire is at stake. I submit that it is not beneath our dignity to insert a provision in this Bill that it shall only come into operation after the British military authorities have given their consent to it. I may be all wrong, but it occurs to me that the proposed amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) is most deserving of the approval of the committee. I repeat that I shall be proud to see our soldiers enabled to exercise their franchise, but the machinery provided for in this Bill is obscure, and it lends itself to serious irregularities, I will not say corruption. Nevertheless, if the Government desires to pass it, they should at least take care, when this franchise is to be exercised in a foreign country, by our soldiers who are fighting under the direction of the British War Office, that the approval of the British military authorities should be obtained.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not want to contradict the description of affairs with regard to the operation of this legislation which the hon. gentleman has just made. I think his description is a conclusive demonstration of the entire absence of any necessity for the suggested amendment. Our soldiers are soldiers absolutely and undoubtedly, and I do not quite understand what the hon. gentleman's suggestion could do to produce a different situation as regards the carrying on of any war-like operations under the control of the British War Office authorities. It has not entered into my mind to conceive that this legislation of ours could in its operation under any conceivable circumstances be allowed to interfere with the performance of their duties by our soldiers. If it does interfere, then if we go to Lord Kitchener to ask his leave to let it interfere, I have no doubt that it will be his duty to refuse that permission just as it will certainly be utterly cheeky and impertinent for us to ask for it to operate under conditions where it will interfere. On the other hand, under conditions where it will not interfere, which are the only conditions under which it can operate, I really cannot bring myself to see that Lord Kitchener is of such a disposition that we shall forfeit his good-will because simply we allow something to go on that in no way interferes with the performance of the military duties of our men. In other words, according to conditions, one thing will happen or the other. If the conditions are such that the carrying out of this voting will interfere with military duties, Lord Kitchener neither would nor should grant us permission, and we certainly should not go asking a permission which he neither would nor should grant. On the other hand, conditions may be such that all this will interfere in no way with military operations, and I for my part decline to assume that it will be considered necessary for us to go and ask leave, and objectionable if we do not ask leave, when we are simply allowing a law, having to do not with the performance of the soldier's duty but with the exercise of the citizen's right, to take its course and to operate with regard to our own citizens.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am sure the discussion that has taken place during the last two or three days on this subject must have satisfied the hon. Minister of Justice that it is very difficult to lay down conditions under which the vote of the Canadian soldiers can be taken at the front. The very fact that the Bill now before us is an altogether different Bill from the one introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice some two or three days ago is proof of what I say, and the minister must surely see now that the longer it is discussed, the more difficulties arise in the way of carrying out this proposition. If that is the case, why not go back to the proper course? My hon. friend must be particularly anxious to have the soldiers vote when he is going to all this trouble and proposing a Bill that cannot be carried out in any reasonable manner. If my hon. friend and the Government are so anxious to have the votes of the soldiers, why not do the decent, fair and honest thing, and say that there will be no election at the present time? Why not wait until the war is over and let the soldiers come back, and then all those who are entitled to vote will be allowed to vote? Would not that be better than putting forward a half-baked Bill such as the one we are now discussing which proposes ways and means of having the votes taken and sent back here, when neither the minister nor any one else knows how his proposition can be carried out? Why go on with a proposition of this kind when the whole trouble can be obviated by doing the proper thing? There is more than a year and a half for this Parliament to run; and if the war is not over in a year from now, although in all probability it will be, if my hon. friend still wants to give the soldiers votes, we shall have a year to consider the matter. But now in the declining hours of the session to put forward a measure of this kind; to try to force it through to give votes to men who are in another country and who are out of our jurisdiction altogether, and then to try to do it without the authority of the one man who has charge of the whole matter and to object to ask the consent of that man, all this is something that I cannot understand. The minister a minute ago seemed to think it would be something unheard of for us to ask that Lord Kitchener should be consulted, or that we should make the Bill inoperative until he gave his consent. On the other hand he thinks it is all right for us to pass legislation instructing different men to carry on certain work when they cannot do anything at all without getting the consent of Lord Kitchener. The whole matter is too absurd for sane men to be arguing over it for two or three days, and to keep the House here in session on a matter of this kind, when the work is all practically done. There are two or three ways in which to get over the difficulty. I have asked my hon. friend once or twice already who has asked that the soldiers be given an opportunity of voting.

An hon. MEMBER: Every one.

Mr. TURRIFF: I venture to say that not a single organization in Canada nor any individual has asked that the soldiers be given an opportunity to vote. It is the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches who are anxious to get the votes—perhaps not so anxious to get the votes as to manipulate them. My hon. friend now must see the difficulties in the way, and he still refuses to make the Bill inoperative until Lord Kitchener gives his consent. Imagine Lord Kitchener consenting to an election being taken on a certain day, and on that day word comes for a general advance against the enemy.

Mr. DOHERTY: Just imagine asking Lord Kitchener leave for a thing like that!

Mr. TURRIFF: That is exactly what my hon. friend will be asking under this Bill, that is, for authority to take a vote at the front when he does not know at what moment after that authority is given orders may come for a general advance, with the result that the vote may be taken at one part of the front and not at another part. It is quite likely, as some hon. gentlemen have pointed out, that the officers commanding in certain cases will say: I am not here to make politics; I am not here to peddle around begging votes from this man or from that man; I am here to fight the battles of the Empire, and I will take no part in this whatever. Therefore you will have some sections of the army voting and other sections not voting. Although I have been in this House for a good many years, I have never before seen such a crude piece of legislation introduced.

I would sincerely ask the Minister of Justice to withdraw this Bill. It is an impracticable proposition. If he wants to get the votes of the soldiers let him put off the elections until the war is over. If the war is not over next year we can easily get authority from the Imperial Parliament to extend this Parliament until the war is over.

Then, when the soldiers come back, every one who is entitled to vote will be able to cast that vote and cast it in the proper manner.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire to say just one word in answer to the Minister of Justice. Impressed as he must necessarily be by the force of the argument that this Parliament has no right to impose a duty on the officers of the Imperial army, he said that this measure imposed no duty, that it is merely an enabling law. Let us see the evidence. Subsection 3 of section 2 provides that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall notify the secretary of the High Commissioner by cable of a general election, and the secretary shall thereupon send a sufficient number of ballot papers and envelopes to the chief paymaster of the Canadian expeditionary force, who shall forward the same to the several regimental paymasters who shall deliver the same to the officers commanding squadrons, companies and batteries. Now, let us see the "enabling" part of it; "and such officers shall give each volunteer under their respective command making the affidavit in form (b) before such officer a ballot paper, and shall fold it in a certain manner and place it in the envelope. It is then provided that the certificate in form (c) shall be signed by the officer who shall also securely close the envelope containing the ballot paper which shall then be sent by such officer by post to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

If that is not imperative language, I fail to know how imperative language can be framed. That is not permissive; it is not an enabling clause but declaring what their duty shall be in connection with the taking of these votes. The Minister of Justice says that this has not the effect of imposing on these officers any duty which would interfere with their military duty. Who is to be the judge of that? This Parliament has said that these Canadian soldiers are to have a vote and that these Imperial officers shall give the opportunity to vote to every man who makes the affidavit before them. Does not that impose duties upon the officers that might interfere with the discharge of their military duties? If not, I fail to know how language could be employed to do so. We heard the suggestion that was made yesterday by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) or some other hon. gentleman on that side. From this side it was suggested that the Secretary for War might not permit this. The hon. gentleman whom I am quoting said he could not imagine the Secretary of State for War taking such a stand, because it would create a deplorable and unfortunate situation. What did that mean? It meant that, this Parliament having declared that it should be the duty of these Imperial officers to allow a vote to be taken and make an affidavit and distribute the ballots, if Lord Kitchener should say that this should not be done it would create an unfortunate situation—that is it would create a conflict between the Secretary of State for War and this Parliament. That would indeed be unfortunate. But all that could be avoided if it were provided that these sections shall not be acted upon until submitted to the Secretary for War and approved by him. If the Secretary for War were consulted and thought that the voting could be carried out, it would create harmony, whereas in the present form it is likely to create friction and entire want of harmony. It seems to me that in taking the stand he has taken in regard to this amendment, the Minister of Justice is taking a position which cannot be justified and is likely to create friction and lead to great dissatisfaction.

Amendment (Mr. Pugsley) negatived.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I give notice that I will move this amendment on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER: Where mention is made of the envelope, is it provided that the electoral district in which the voter is entitled to vote shall be marked on the envelope? That does not seem to be provided, but I think it should be

Mr. DOHERTY: Provision is made that upon the affidavit endorsed on the back of the envelope, the elector, if he is qualified as having been a resident for thirty days shall set forth his place of residence in a certain precise manner. The first suggestion was that he should state the name of the electoral district. But it was pointed out that many of these men, while knowing where they live, might not, especially in view of the comparatively new redistribution, know the correct designation of their electoral districts. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will be able to determine in which electoral district the soldier would vote, and he will forward the envelopes to the several districts. Those who are qualified as electors in a particular electoral district will set that forth, each that he was qualified to vote at a certain place in a cer-

tain province. In that event, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will determine what the electoral district is and forward the ballot accordingly. The hon. member will notice that there are two alternate "Paragraphs 1" of the affidavit B provided to be made for these alternative methods of voting.

Mr. OLIVER: The first alternative makes the voter swear:

I am not qualified to vote in any other electoral district.

That would indicate that he swears that he was a voter in a certain electoral district.

Mr. DOHERTY: He swears to a certain fact—that he resided for thirty days at a certain place. Under this law, that ballot would be sent to the electoral district in which that place is situated, unless the voter was at the time of his enlistment a qualified voter in some other district, and so he is asked to negative that statement.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not see anything in the form requiring the mention of an electoral district.

Mr. DOHERTY: It says:

I was qualified to be a voter at in the province of .

It does not say that he shall mention the name of the electoral district, but shall give the place where he was entitled to vote, which will convey to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery information as to the electoral district.

Mr. OLIVER: I think where a man is entitled to claim that he is a voter, it would be only right that he should name the electoral district as well as the place of residence. I can see the possibility of difficulty under the section. If a man is a voter, he ought to know in what district he is a voter.

Mr. DOHERTY: That generally is true. This subject is one that was a good deal discussed in the committee—this form of affidavit. The first instance given was with regard to the city of Montreal. It was stated that both as regards the men who reside for thirty days, and as regards men who have been voters perhaps for years, in view of our redistribution there would be great danger of men misapprehending the electoral district in which their places of residence had been situated, though quite aware that by virtue of their residence they are qualified voters. My own constituency is now very largely made up of people who heretofore never were in the electoral division of St. Anne; people whose knowledge on the subject, derived, perhaps, from years of being settled there, would be that they were in the county of Jacques Cartier. I have reference at the moment to the city of Verdun. A man in that situation might be expected to fall into error, but if the soldier swears that he was entitled to vote in the city of Verdun at the time he was enlisted, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will have no difficulty, with the Redistribution Act in front of him, in determining where the vote belongs. What applies to my own constituency applies, I think, to all constituencies as at present constituted in the city of Montreal. The same thing would be true of the city of Toronto and the city of Edmonton, which, I understand, has been divided into two electoral districts. Persons who are not informed as to where the line runs between East Edmonton and West Edmonton, might be very much puzzled to know in which electoral district they were when they enlisted, but they would know that they had qualifications in the city of Edmonton and that they resided at some particular place in the city of Edmonton. In view of that situation, instead of requiring the designation of the electoral district, we provided for a designation of the place at which the man had been accustomed to vote, from which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will have no difficulty in settling the question of the electoral district.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—officers who are candidates not to act:

Mr. DOHERTY: Carrying out a promise I made to the hon. member for Sudbury and Queens this afternoon, I beg to move that this section be amended by adding to it the words "and failing him for any of the causes aforesaid, the next below him in rank, and so on." Further, in view of some suggestions that were made as to the possibility of the commanding officer declining to perform the duties prescribed under the Act, I think we should make section 3 apply in the case of the officer designated or next in rank declining to perform the duty as well as in the case of the officer who is prevented from acting. To produce that result, I beg to move that the section be further amended by inserting in line 18, after the word "it" and before the words "the duty," the words "or declines to perform it."

Mr. MACDONALD: The first amendment proposed might produce a condition where the sergeant would be the responsible officer.

Mr. DOHERTY: The question is whether it is better to leave it possible that the sergeant may sometimes perform this duty than to leave it possible that it shall not be performed at all. If the Act operates as I hope it will operate, I do not think that a case of this kind will happen very often. If there should be ground for anticipating that the officers generally would refuse to do the duty assigned to them, then, of course, this position would come into general operation. If it is thought preferable, I would limit the operation of the section as amended so that the duty should not be performed by an officer who is subordinate to a commissioned officer. If we do that, however, we may create a condition where, merely for want of an officer, the men may lose their votes. It seemed to me that we might with perfect safety, in the few cases where this would arise, allow the non-commissioned officer to do the work rather than cause the soldiers to lose their votes because of there being no officer to perform this duty.

Mr. MACDONALD: One of the results of the provision might be that the officers would turn their work over to the sergeants.

Mr. DOHERTY: Even if it be a violation of obligation on the part of the officers not to fulfil this duty, we cannot make them do a thing if they do not want to do it. The case which I had in anticipation was that of an officer who might happen to be a candidate in an election or who might be prevented from acting. The latter case, I think, will be more frequent than the case where he may decline to act. If he declines to perform the duty, we leave it to the next officer in rank. We start with the company officer, who has under him, before you get to the non-commissioned officer, five officers. I think we may fairly assume that some one of these six officers will be able and willing to perform the duty.

Mr. OLIVER: As a civilian, speaking from what I have read, I suggest that the sergeants do all the work any way.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not prepared to say anything about that. When I was in the army we used to find something to do.

Mr. MACDONALD: I think this is another argument in support of the suggestion that a superintendent of some kind should be appointed. Has the minister arrived at any solution of the difficulty that was suggested to-day in this respect?

Mr. DOHERTY: I pointed out that if it were considered that my suggestion would provide for what was desired, I was prepared to let it go to a small committee for consideration. That offer met no response, and at the present moment I do not think that we are prepared to re-open that consideration. The amendment suggested did not provide for persons who would have the receiving of the ballots.

It only looked to provide for representatives of the different parties to be present when the voting took place. It did not look to provide machinery for taking the vote.

Amendments agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On sec. 4—issue of writ:

Mr. DOHERTY: I might explain that by a printer's error the words
12 m. "an election" have been printed instead of "a general election."

Mr. OLIVER: What is the meaning of these references?

Mr. DOHERTY: They refer to the sections of the Dominion Act prescribing the duties of returning officers and poll clerks. We are trying to make the duties of the returning officers and poll clerks at the camps in Canada approach as nearly as possible to the duties that have to be discharged by the ordinary returning officers and poll clerks at an election in Canada.

Mr. OLIVER: The section does not make clear that this returning officer is not the returning officer of an electoral district. If, as I understand, he is a returning officer specially appointed, I would suggest that words be used to convey that idea.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am quite willing to make that clear. It follows the wording of the Dominion Elections Act. As regards the issuing of the writ, the Dominion Elections Act says:

> Every writ for an election shall be in form A and shall be dated and be returnable on such days as the Governor General determines, and shall be addressed and forwarded by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the person appointed by the Governor General, as hereinafter provided, and shall be transmitted to such person by mail, unless otherwise ordered by the Governor General.

And then 76 provides that:

The person to whom a writ for an election is so addressed shall be the returning officer at such election.

I took it that these definitions provided for the issue of the writ and for the holding of the poll at each military camp.

Mr. OLIVER: I am perfectly satisfied with the explanation although on reading the section it was not quite clear. There are two regiments in barracks in the constituency of East Edmonton and there is a squadron of cavalry in the constituency of Strathcona within the limits of greater Edmonton, but in different constituencies and having no connection. The squadron of cavalry has no connection with the infantry regiment. Would each be considered a base which would be given to a returning officer or would one returning officer handle both establishments?

Mr. DOHERTY: My impression would be, if these forces have no connection one with the other, that we would have to provide a separate returning officer for each.

Mr. VERVILLE: What would be the result if a man is not on the list in the place that he chose to describe as his place of residence six months prior to the date of his enlistment? My hon. friend knows the position we are in in the cities of the province of Quebec. He knows that registration takes place in December. A man might not be on the list because he went before the list was made. Will a man who is in a position to swear that he lived within a certain polling subdivision for six months prior to the time of his enlistment have the right to vote?

Mr. DOHERTY: Under the cities' system if the lists were prepared at the time they were enrolled, or if they were on an electoral list that was still in force—it may not have been a new one—they would be entitled under this Act to vote in that electoral district wherein they would have been qualified to vote if the election had taken place the day that they enrolled. If I understand the city system aright in Montreal, there is always a list in force. Their lists are revised every two years and one list remains in force until the next one is revised. In the case suggested the fact that the voter was on the list of two years previous if that were still in force or on the newly made list would entitle him to claim as having been a person qualified to vote in the district on the day he enlisted. If, on the other hand, he was not on that existing voters' list he would not be in a position to say at the time he was enrolled he was a qualified voter in the district, but he might claim, if that was the place where he had lived for thirty days, within the six months before enlistment, that he was entitled to vote in that district because of his thirty days prior residence.

Mr. VERVILLE: What list will be in force in five or six weeks from now in Montreal?

Mr. DOHERTY: If I am not mistaken, the electoral lists that were prepared in December were revised in January and are actually in force now.

Mr. VERVILLE: They were supposed to be in force on April 1.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know the exact day, but I know there was a period of time which I think will now have elapsed. It will be in force for two years or until there is another revision.

On section 4, subsection 4—at expiration of ten days returning officer to prepare lists of volunteers:

Mr. OLIVER: The question arises as to what are the terms of the revision of this list.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no provision for the revision of the list. What is arranged is that the returning officer shall make a list of the people who have given him notice. This is useful, because it informs him of who are the people who pretend to be voters in that district and it enables him to know the electoral districts he has to handle. The Act does not expressly provide for making it a final list in such a manner as to determine the right of the voter. A man who has arrived at camp after ten days have gone by, or who is precluded from sending his name should not be prevented from voting on polling day. I do not think it would be fair to make any list which the returning officer is able to provide an absolute settlement of a man's right to vote by reason of the existence of his name upon it, or the absence of his name from it. The provision requiring the prepartion of the list is really a measure of convenience, but there is no provision to make the presence of the man's name on the list essential to his right to exercise the franchise. The provision for the making of this list is for the purpose of facilitating and making more convenient the holding of a poll, but it is not provided that the list shall be treated as de-

termining whether or not a person has the right to vote.

Mr. MACDONALD: Can the returning officer refuse a man his vote after he has made the affidavit?

Mr. DOHERTY: If nobody requires him to be sworn he will vote.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has the returning officer the right to strike his name off?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no provision by which he is entitled to strike the name off. We have to have qualification by affidavit, but I think it is fair not to make that affidavit sent in in writing to the returning officer conclusive in the event of a question being raised. For example, in a camp like Valcartier there might be a large number of voters from a certain constituency and the candidates might find it desirable to send representatives, so that I do not think it would be fair that because a man has handed in an affidavit ten or fifteen days before, the representatives of the candidates should not be entitled to swear the voter to the essentials of his qualifications in the presence of a returning officer.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is no provision for that in the Act.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes; the Act is subject to all the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act which are applicable.

Mr. MACDONALD: I find no provisions here, after the returning officer has made the list, for adding to or striking off any names that may be on the list.

Mr. DOHERTY: Because being on that list is not essential to the right to vote.

Mr. MACDONALD: Where do you provide for anything outside that list?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think I understand the idea of the minister, although I do not approve of it. The idea is that the moment a person has taken the affidavit he becomes an elector, and his vote can be challenged, but there is no provision in the Act for challenging his vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: The provision that makes it possible to swear a man in the presence of the returning officer and the scrutineer is that in subsection 6 of section 4 which says that except as herein otherwise provided, the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act relating to the power and duties of the returning officer and other officers shall so far as applicable apply.

Section 153 says:

> Except in the province of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Yukon Territory, an elector, if required by the deputy-returning officer, the poll clerk, one of the candidates, or an agent of a candidate, or by an elector present, shall before receiving his ballot paper, take such oath of qualification as by the law of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to take, such changes having been made in the form of oath as are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held, and shall also, if required, take the oath in form Y.

I am free to admit that we are not dealing with an oath that is required for a provincial qualification. There are other provisions and I am pretty confident that I could lay my hands on them; but to make the matter absolutely clear, we will put it in so many words so that there can be no possible doubt about it. At the time I examined the Act I was satisfied that, by referring back to these provisions, we would make it possible for a man to be sworn at the time as to his qualifications, but as there may be some doubt about it, we will put it in.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is the general language used in subsection 6, where you are adopting the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, sufficiently broad to cover the appointment and presence of scrutineers at the polls?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is a subdivision of the statute called "the polling." Section 137 says:

> In addition to the deputy-returning officer and the poll clerk, the candidates and their agents, not exceeding two in number for each candidate in each polling station, and, in the absence of agents, two electors to represent each candidate at the request of such electors, and no others, shall be permitted to remain in the room where the votes are given during the time the poll remains open.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The trouble is this, that you may have thirty or forty candidates represented at one poll, and you may have 230.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is barely possible, but it is assumed that the returning officer in adjusting his poll will make as many polling places as are necessary. We assumed that if he had a knowledge of the different electoral districts with which he had to deal, in cases where there might be only a few voters in each electoral district, he would probably endeavour to subdivide his polls so as to include them in one poll. If he have a large number on one electoral

district, he may have to provide several polls for that district. We leave it to the judgment of the returning officer so to dispose of these things as to make the matter workable. One cannot say in advance how many electors a returning officer may have to deal with. In one camp he may have only one or two, while in another camp he may have half a dozen. The provision is:

> The returning officer shall proceed to hold such number of polls upon the day fixed for the holding of the election in the several electoral districts, within such camp or base, and appoint such deputy-returning officers and officers as may be necessary therefor.

I think we can leave it to the returning officer to make the necessary arrangements. I hardly think that any returning officer will arrange to hold polls for twenty electoral districts all in the same polling booth unless he has secured very large accommodation. If there are half a dozen voters from one electoral district, I doubt if there is any reason to anticipate that there will be representatives of candidates there. If the voters are numerous, there will probably be representatives of candidates there, but it seems that it might properly be left to the returning officer for his own comfort if for no other reason to provide sufficient accommodation.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to say in plain words whatever right the candidates have with regard to the scrutineers.

Mr. DOHERTY: If it is desired to have it copied in, I shall have it copied in, but I would ask my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), for instance, if he has any doubt that when this Bill says that the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act relating to the polling shall apply, all of those sections which are in the Dominion Elections Act under the title polling apply.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The difficulty is this: we have now over 230 constituencies, and it is not an extravagant supposition that there may be at a camp the electors of perhaps thirty or forty constituencies. In the camp at Montreal, or at Ottawa or at any other central place, there may be candidates from British Columbia, Nova Scotia, and other parts of Canada. Under the law as it is, at present electors can be scrutineers without any authority from the candidate. Any two electors in a constituency can go and be scrutineers; but it might be impossible to get authority from a candidate in British Columbia to have representatives at the poll at Montreal or at Ottawa, and I believe some provision should be inserted that any two electors in any constituency can be scrutineers for all on the one side or on the other side of politics.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no objection to that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Two electors in the city of Montreal could go as scrutineers, and if they were to be scrutineers for one candidate, they could be scrutineers for all the candidates.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The matter will really work out in that way, because the right hon. gentleman will remember that if no person is appointed as scrutineer for the candidate, any two electors can undertake to represent him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: They can represent one candidate, but not all the candidates.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think they can.

Mr. MACDONALD: There are a great many deputy returning officers who will say that this legislation does not provide for candidates' representatives. It would be wise if the minister would draw up some section to meet the suggestion of my right hon. friend to provide for two agents of the same political party as the representatives for all the candidates who may be voted for at the same poll.

Mr. DOHERTY: I would be inclined to think, if it happened that in the same polling booth votes were being polled for more than one electoral district, that two electors coming in there would be entitled to represent candidates from different electoral districts. Now, as regards the possible ignorance of returning officers that the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act apply with regard to polls, I would like to point out that in addition to that we have a provision:

> This Act shall be construed as one with the Dominion Elections Act.

The duties of returning officers as well as others are to be governed by that. It would be his duty under the Dominion Elections Act, and under this Act, to furnish the deputies not only with this Act but with the Dominion Elections Act, and furthermore to furnish them with the instructions that are got out. Of course, if considered necessary, the Dominion Elections Act could be copied instead of telling

the deputy returning officers and the returning officers that the provisions of the Act apply. But I should hope—as these returning officers are to instruct the deputies—that we should be able to find men of sufficient intelligence, that when told that all the provisions about the duties of returning officers and deputy returning officers, and about the polling and the taking of the vote, would apply, they would be able to understand that without it being necessary to print these sections; but I will get them printed if—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is not necessary. It was only to understand the Bill and to put it as intelligibly as possible. I appreciate that we should have, perhaps, more legislation about scrutineers. But scrutineers are chiefly useful to prevent personation. There cannot be much personation here, because there is means of identification. Two electors can see that the formalities are followed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it will work out that way. Let that section stand.

Mr. OLIVER: Many people who will have to work out this Act will find great difficulty in referring to the Dominion Elections Act and reading one into the other. There are not nearly so many people learned in the law on the outskirts of civilization as in the city of Ottawa, and it is surprising how difficult it is for a man who is not used to such work to go through such an Act and read one section in the light of another. For that reason, I would ask that whatever is required in regard to scrutineers and the voter getting his name on the list up to whatever time is allowed him— that these provisions be made perfectly clear on the face of the Bill. Another thing: Are the returning officers and deputy returning officers to be civilians or military men?

Mr. DOHERTY: They will be appointed as other returning officers and deputy returning officers are appointed. The returning officer will appoint his deputy just as other returning officers and deputy-returning officers are appointed. There is nothing to require nor to prevent him selecting military men if he wants to.

Mr. OLIVER: But he does not need to choose military men?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, the Governor General will appoint the returning officer for the camp just as he appoints the deputy-returning officer for an electoral district.

Mr. VERVILLE: The minister says that the Dominion Election Act is to be followed. But in these places there is a certain military rule. Is the minister going to do anything under this clause to make sure that the military rule shall not override the Elections Act? I know that has been done in other cases and probably would be done in this.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think there is room for the slightest doubt that the Parliament of Canada controls soldiers in Canada. And where this Act, if it is passed, says that a certain thing shall be done, the soldier has to obey as much as any other man. Here we have an express direct clause, providing what is to be done in the camp, and there is no military rule that can override Parliament's expressed provision.

Section stands.

On subsection 7,—reporting vote to several electoral districts:

On section 4, subsection 8—poll at which to vote:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In all cases, except under this proposed legislation, the electoral list determines whether or not a man has a right to vote. If he is on the list, he has a right to vote; if not, he has not a right to vote. In this case, what constitutes the right to vote is the affidavit of the soldier.

Mr. DOHERTY: A man whose name has been put upon the list must vote at the place where he is allotted, and not elsewhere. I would not have it understood that this section implies that the man who is not allotted at all should not vote anywhere.

Mr. MACDONALD: There should go with that the correlative provision that the military authorities shall see that facilities are provided to enable the volunteer to vote at the poll to which he is assigned.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am willing to insert a provision to that end, although I had not thought it necessary.

Subsection agreed to.

Section 4, subsection 9—obtaining certificate that voter is on list where voting on previous qualification:

Mr. MACDONALD: Under this provision a soldier from a western constituency who is in an eastern camp would have to communicate with his friends in the far-distant

constituency in order that the certificate of the returning officer might be obtained.

Mr. DOHERTY: There might be some difficulty about that. The provision makes it a duty for the returning officer in a certain electoral district who receives notice that somebody has claimed to be qualified in that district, to send the electoral list there. The returning officer who receives the list may ascertain whether the name of the man in question is upon it. Perhaps it would be well to put in some words providing that if the returning officer fails to find that name on the list, he should have power to reject the vote.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 4, subsection 10—procedure when volunteers leaving Canada before election day:

Mr. VERVILLE: I wish to ask again whether the amendment which I proposed at eight o'clock would be in order.

Mr. DOHERTY: Inasmuch as the Bill which we are dealing with provides for an expenditure out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, it had to be preceded by a resolution assented to by His Royal Highness the Governor General. That resolution was looking to a provision being made for votes being given to the military forces, the expenses in connection therewith to be paid in the manner which I have indicated. I do not think that it is open to us to introduce into this Bill an amendment extending the scope of the proposed legislation, and introducing an entirely different subject matter, unless we have a new resolution assented to by the Governor, and re-introduce the Bill. For that reason, I do not think it is advisable to accept an amendment providing for something entirely different from that which was originally contemplated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am not sure that that is a good reason.

Mr. DOHERTY: In my own experience I have found myself precluded from the possibility of providing—not in connection with a Bill exactly like this, but in connection with a Bill that required a resolution—for something not contemplated in the resolution, and which would involve the cost or charge of carrying out the thing not contemplated. If it is necessary that the Governor General should assent, surely he must assent to what he understands. He has assented to a charge being created for the purpose of providing funds for soldiers, and, under guise of that assent, to provide for votes for large numbers of other people, with a possible expenditure connected therewith, would be legislating in respect of something that the resolution did not contemplate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It seems to me that there can be no expenditure in connection with the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Maisonneuve. It is simply to provide that railway officials who are engaged in train service shall be enabled to vote either on the polling day or on the day preceding.

Mr. DOHERTY: It may not be a very heavy charge, but you are imposing new duties on the deputy returning officers; and either you are going to compel them to do two days' work for one day's pay, or you must provide them with remuneration for two days' work. However, without insisting over much on that, I have said what I desire to say in regard to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: In my judgment the Bill referred to the committee by the House is an Act to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise. Bourinot says, at page 546:

> It is a clear and indisputable principle of parliamentary law that a committee is bound by, and is not at liberty to depart from, the order of reference.

I understand that the only thing referred to the committee from the House was the Bill under consideration, and accordingly I think it my duty to declare the amendment out of order.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—distribution of Act:

Mr. MARCIL: I thought the minister had agreed to strike out the word "enrolled?"

Mr. DOHERTY: We struck out the words "enrolment or "enlistment" in places where it might possibly create some confusion. I do not think it can do any harm here, but as I have no desire to insist on its staying there, I move that the word "enrolled" be struck out.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 10—when voter cannot vote under this Act:

Mr. MARCIL: This is when he has to leave camp and go to the polling booth?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, if he is a voter qualified for that electoral district.

Mr. MARCIL: If this will interfere with his military duties, has he to obtain permission from the military authorities?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If his voting at the camp interfered with his military duties, he would have to get permission from the military authorities.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 11—termination of Act:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I see that the minister has passed over the clause he prepared as clause 4, providing for the appointment of scrutineers.

Mr. DOHERTY: I explained this morning what happened with regard to this clause, and I am sorry if I did not make myself understood. That clause, as I have explained two or three times, was drafted with a view to having some conference as to whether it should be carried out. It was inserted in that first reprint of the Bill by a misunderstanding, and that fact was one of the principal reasons that led me to make the second reprint. I said this morning with regard to the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. John that if something on the line of the suggestion that is contained in that section, modified as to the number of commissioners and providing for the appointment of scrutineers, would in any way be satisfactory I should be glad to consider it, and even have a special committee to deal with something on those lines. As I understood it, the response that was made to that suggestion was an insistence on the proposition of the hon. member for St. John, and I said in answer to some hon. member that I was not making a proposition on the subject, but endeavouring to meet the suggestions, and that if anything on that line would be acceptable I should be glad to try and work it out. This morning I put before the House this corrected reprint, with the explanation that the insertion of that clause as printed in the Bill distributed yesterday was the result simply of a misunderstanding, and I am sorry if I have created the impression that I proposed to go on with the first reprint which has been corrected by this corrected reprint, which does not contain that suggestion.

1 a.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister should state one further thing. He was asked whether these scrutineers would have any notice of when and where the votes would be taken, to which the minister replied in the negative. Therefore, it seems to me that was simply an empty proposition.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not discussing the value of the proposition at all. I was explaining that I did not put forward that clause as a provision of my Bill, but was endeavouring to see if a suggestion carried out on those lines would be acceptable. The hon. member for St. John, for reasons he thought sufficient, did not consider it acceptable.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We understood the whole thing very differently. The hon. member for St. John suggested that we should have scrutineers, and have some check upon the voting. He suggested a commission and my hon. friend agreed to that and he suggested that we should proceed with the Bill. We thought that, before we proceeded with the Bill as to the manner of voting, we should be able to provide some check preferably by way of a commission, and we offered some suggestions as to that. If the idea of a check upon the voting in the form of a commission should be adopted it would be necessary to modify the clauses accordingly. That is the reason why we did not press the matter.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not want to take advantage of anything that may have been a misunderstanding. The hon. gentleman will bear me out when I say that hon. gentlemen opposite did not consider my suggestion satisfactory. At three o'clock, with this matter standing in that shape, I did state that we were not prepared to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John, but that if something on the line of carrying out what was printed there, with the necessary modifications if we were to subtitute two commissioners, and if they were to have power to appoint scrutineers, would be acceptable, I would be glad to consider it and to refer it to a committee. There was some discussion as to how that was to work out, and I was asked whether I would consider whether there should be a provision that every officer, before he proceeded to take the votes, should call in the scrutineers. I said I did not think that would be workable, and I understood that was a proposition that was entirely unacceptable.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Only to myself; I did not speak for the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DOHERTY: I put the proposition in the most general terms to the hon. member for St. John. However, I do not want tc draw any consequences from anything that may have been a misunderstanding. If that was understood in the other way, I shall be glad to consider some provision for the appointment of scrutineers.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think we might consider one or two matters that have been allowed to stand a little later in the forenoon, and I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 1.12 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, April 14, 1915.

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

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

EMPLOYEES FROM L'ASSOMPTION COUNTY.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. (a) What is the number of the public employees from the county of L'Assomption who, since the 21st September, 1911, have been dismissed from the inside and outside service, and (b) what is the name of each such employee?

2. (a) What is the number, and (b) what are the names of the persons who have been appointed to replace such dismissed employees, and their places of residence at the time of such appointments?

Mr. CODERRE:

Inland Revenue: 1. (a) Outside service, 4 (b) J. A. Bonin, J. H. Lafortune, H. Forest, H. Locas. 2. (a) 4. (b) P. Ethier, L'Assomption; J. J. Gareau, St. Roch d'Achigan; J. B. T. Richard, L'Epiphanie; O. Brien, St. Lin des Laurentides.

Marine and Fisheries: 1. One lightkeeper, L. Dubois, at Ile à la Bague. 2. One lightkeeper, E. Thouin, at Ile à la Bague, Repentigny, P.Q.

Post Office: Four postmasters have been dismissed in the county of L'Assomption during the period mentioned, as follows: At Pont Mousseau, François Racette, dismissed; A. Brien appointed. At Mascouche, Dionis Roy, dismissed; Napoleon Dugas appointed. At St. Paul L'Ermite, Omer Seguin, dismissed; Joseph Marion appointed. At St. Roch l'Achigan, J. H. Lafortune, dismissed; Evariste Beaudoin appointed. So far as the department is aware the new postmasters were residing at the above places at the time of their appointments.

Public Works: The department does not keep a record of where employees come from other than in the inside service, where place of birth is given.

POSTAL STATION L, MONTREAL.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Has the Government recently awarded a contract for certain furnishings and fixtures for postal station L, in Montreal?

2. If so, were tenders called for?

3. What was the amount of the lowest tender, and the name of the tenderer?

4. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. $1,797. Castle & Son and the Melville Office Furniture Co.

4. Yes, 11 tenders were received. Messrs. Castle & Son and the Melville Office Furniture Co., and the Berlin Office and Fixture Co. being equal and lowest, the contract was awarded to Castle & Son and the Melville Furniture Co., but the latter company has transferred its interest to the parent company, Castle & Son.

CARSLAKE HOTEL COMPANY.

Mr. VERVILLE:

What is the total amount of the claim made by the Carslake Hotel Company in the case now pendng before the Exchequer Court?

Mr. ROGERS: $407,880.

MAJOR McQUARRIE.

*Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Has Major McQuarrie resigned or been dismissed from service in connection with the Department of Militia and Defence?

2. Is the Department of Militia and Defence aware that, as alleged, the said McQuarrie received money for using his influence with the Minister of Militia in connection with purchase for the Government?

3. If the alleged resignation or dismissal of Major McQuarrie has taken effect, is it the intention of the Government that he should retain his rank in the militia?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Resigned.

2. No. Major McQuarrie was instrumental in selling motor trucks to the Department of Militia in 1912, and, it is presumed, received his commission as any other agent would.

3. The matter has not been considered.

CEREBRO-SPINAL MENINGITIS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many Canadian soldiers enlisted for active service have contracted cerebro-spinal meningitis since August 4, 1914?
2. (a) How many of the cases referred to in paragraph one have resulted fatally, and (b) how many have completely recovered?
3. Is the disease above referred to regarded as contagious?

Major General HUGHES:

1. 85.
2. (a) 47: (b) 28.
3. Yes.

SUPPLIES FOR PERMANENT FORCE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Have tenders been asked for the supply of meats, groceries, bread and provisions for the permanent force at Halifax, for the year 1915-16?
2. If so, to whom, and at what prices were the contracts awarded?

Major General HUGHES:

1. Yes.
2. E. A. Thompson, beef, 11 3-5 cents per lb.; mutton, 11 3-5 cents per lb.

J. J. Scriven & Sons, bread, 4½ cents per lb.

John Tobin & Co., jams (7's), 10¾ cents per lb.; (5's), 11 1-5 cents per lb.

Nickerson & Co., potatoes, 9-10 cent per lb.; butter, creamery, 27⅞ cents per lb.; butter, dairy, 24⅞ cents per lb.; cheese, 14¾ cents per lb.

E. W. Crease & Sons, sugar, white, 6¾ cents per lb.; salt, $1.50 per 210 lb.; prunes, dried, 8¾ cents per lb.; rolled oats, 4½ cents per lb.

Davis & Fraser, bacon, breakfast, 15½ cents per lb.; bacon, green, 10 cents per lb.; lard, pure, 12½ cents per lb.; lard, cpd., 11½ cents per lb.

R. B. Seeton & Co., pepper, 20 cents per lb.; rice, 3⅞ cents per lb.

Wentzells, Ltd., beans, 5¼ cents per lb.; split peas, 5½ cents per lb.; fresh vegetables, 1¼ cents per lb.

I. B. Schaffner & Co., flour, strong bakers, $3.45 per sack, 98 lbs.; flour, patent, $3.65 per sack, 98 lbs.

F. J. Murphy, emptying dry earth closets, $45 per month.

W. E. Chamber, emptying refuse pits, $70 per month.

Robert K. Turner, removal of manure, $20 per month.

Ferguson O'Neill, conveyance of rations from Halifax to Camperdown, per trip, $6 per trip; conveyance of men, with their arms and equipment, from Halifax to Camperdown, or vice versa, 75 cents per man per trip; conveyance of men's kits from Halifax to Camperdown, or vice versa, 25 cents per man per trip.

Contractors, Ltd.: Wicks, lamp, ¼-inch, 42 cents per yd.; ½-inch, 54 cents per yd.; ⅝-inch, 58 cents per yd.; ¾-inch, 60 cents per yd.; ⅞-inch, 66 cents per yd.; 1-inch, 72 cents per yd.; 1¼-inch, 84 cents per yd.; 1½-inch, 90 cents per yd.; wicks, colza, 78 cents per lb.; candles, parafin, 9¼ cents per lb.; gasoline, 23 cents per gal.; gas oil, 15 cents per gal.; colza oil, 94½ cents per gal.; fuel oil, 17 cents per gal.; coal oil, 16½ cents per gal.

Halifax Steam Laundry: Aprons, compounders, 3 cents each; blankets, Bk. & Hpl., 7 cents each; blankets, horse, 10 cents each; blinds, hospital, 10 cents each; bandages, triangular, 1 cent each; cases, bed, Bk. & Hpl., 12 cents each; cases, bolster, 3 cents each; cases, pillow, hospital, 1½ cents each; covers, chair, 5 cents each; covers, mattress, hospital, 12 cents each; counterpanes, 7 cents each; caps, cooks, 5 cents each; cloths, tea, 4 cents each; clothing, hpl., 3 pieces, 21 cents suit; clothing, hpl., 2 pieces, 14 cents suit; dusters, 1 cent each; drawers, hospital, 4 cents each; handkerchiefs, 1 cent each; haversacks, white, 4 cents each; neckerchiefs, hospital, 1 cent each; nightshirts, hospital, 5 cents each; nose bags, canvas, 10 cents each; puggarees, 1 cent each; rugs, bk. & hpl., 7 cents each; sheets, 3½ cents each; socks, hpl., 23 cents pr.; tablecloths, hpl., 6 cents each; tuques, hpl., 1 cent each; towels, 2 cents each; undershirts, hpl., 4 cents pr.

HON. L. P. PELLETIER.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Did Hon. L. P. Pelletier make a trip down the gulf of St. Lawrence in 1913 or 1914 in a Government boat? If so, what was the name of the boat?
2. Was the hon. gentleman on official business? If so, what was the nature of it?
3. Did any relatives accompany him? If so, how many?
4. How long did the trip last, and what was the cost of the same to the country?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. The department has no knowledge of such a trip.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

J. THEBERGE.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Does J. Théberge, who is mentioned in the Auditor General's Report for the year ending the 31st March, 1914, at page W. 294, as being in the employ of the National Transcontinental railway in the capacity of constable, at $95 per month, still hold that position?

2. Since when has he worked in that capacity of constable for the National Transcontinental railway?

3. Where does the said J. Théberge reside?

4. Who recommended his appointment?

Mr. COCHRANE: The following information has been furnished by the National Transcontinental Railway Commission:

1. No.

2. Since the 2nd of May, 1912.

3. Lorette, province of Quebec.

4. No information.

ISAAC'S HARBOUR AND CANSO LOBSTER HATCHERIES.

1. Who are the employees of the Department of Naval Affairs at Isaac's Harbour, N.S., and Canso, N.S., in connection with the lobster hatcheries at said points?

2. What are the dates of their present employment, and their remuneration respectively?

Mr. HAZEN:

Canso Hatchery.

James Meagher, $3 per day, 1905; James Richardson, $2 per day, 1912; James Sullivan, $3 per day, 1912; James Meads, $2 per day, 1912; Richard McDonald, $2 per day, 1912; Thomas McNeary, $2 per day, 1913; William Peitzsch, $2 per day, 1912.

Isaac's Harbour Hatchery.

Stephen M. Giffin, $3 per day, 1913; James Henderson, $2 per day, 1913; Robert McArthur, $2 per day, 1912; William Giffin, $2 per day, 1913; Harry Silver, $2 per day, 1912.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MESSRS. BOULAY.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Had Mr. J. A. Boulay, of Sayabec, who is mentioned in the Anditor General's Report, at page W. 37, as having received $510 for building an extension to the freight shed at Villroy for the Intercolonial railway, been recommended by any person before the execution of that work? If so, by whom?

2. Did the Department of Railways call for tenders before the execution of that work?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. Tenders were invited by poster advertisement for this work. Two bulk sum tenders were received and the lowest, that of J. A. Boulay, for $510, was accepted.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Had Mr. J. A. Boulay, of Sayabec, who is mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, 1914, page W. 37, as having received $684 for the building of an extension to the freight shed at St. François, on the Intercolonial, been recommended by any person to the Department of Railways before the execution of that work? If so, by whom?

2. Were tenders called for by the department before having such work executed?

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. Tenders were invited by poster advertisement for this work. Three bulk sum tenders were received and the lowest, that of J. A. Boulay, for $699, was accepted.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Is Mr. A. Boulay, who is mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, 1914, page V. 254, as having received $420 for working in the office of the Public Works Department, engineer at Rimouski, still in the employ of the Government?

2. By whom was he recommended before entering the employ of the department?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No.

2. By H. Boulay, Esq., M.P.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Had Mr. J. A. Boulay, of Sayabec, who is mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, 1914, page W. 191, as having sold timber and other materials to the Intercolonial railway for the sum of $667.18, been recommended by any person to the Railway Department prior to said sale? If so, by whom?

2. Were tenders called for the purchase of said efforts and materials?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Had Mr. H. Boulay, of Sayabec, who is mentioned in the Anditor General's Report, 1914, page W-181, as having sold timber and materials to the Intercolonial railway for the sum of $1,489.65, been recommended by any person to the Railway Department to make the said sale? If so, by whom?

2. Were tenders called for by the Railway Department before the purchase of such materials?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. Yes. By circular letter, and the lowest tender accepted.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Had Mr. J. A. Boulay, of Sayabec, who is mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, 1914, page W. 179, as having sold ice to the Intercolonial railway for the sum of $1,800.37, been recommended by any person to the Railway Department before making such sale? If so, by whom?

2. Were tenders called for by the Railway Department before purchasing the said ice?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. Yes, by poster advertisement, and the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Had Mr. J. A. Boulay, of Sayabec, who is mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, page W. 37, as having received $500 for the

extension of a freight shed at Causapscal for the Intercolonial railway, been recommended by any person to the Railway Department before executing that work? If so, by whom?

2. Were tenders called for by the Railway Department before the execution of such work?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. Tenders were invited by poster advertisement for this work. One tender was received from J. A. Boulay for $575 which was accepted.

DISINFECTING APPARATUS.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Has the Government awarded any contract for the disinfecting of the telephone boxes and apparatus in the House of Commons and in the different departments under its control?

2. If so, to what person, company or association was such contract given, and at what price, and on what conditions?

3. Were tenders called for concerning such contract?

4. If so, in what newspapers were the notices of tenders published, what are the names of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No.

1, 2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

WAR SUPPLIES—CLOTHING.

Mr. GRAHAM:

Is the clothing required to re-outfit Canadian Contingent at the front being made in Canada?

Major General HUGHES: Yes.

S.S. RHODA.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. How much did it cost the Government to remove from the St. Lawrence river the boat Rhoda, which was aground at Laprairie since the month of June last?

2. Has the Government compensated Captain Paul or any other person for the loss sustained by the grounding of said boat?

3. What are the names and addresses of the men employed to remove this vessel?

4. What has been done with the hull, boilers and other parts of the boat?

5. If sold, how much money did the Government get for same?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Final returns have not yet been received, but the cost is reported to be in the neighbourhood of and within $1,800, less amount received for scrap.

2. No. The Rhoda grounded, becoming an obstruction to navigation. By the provisions of cap. 115, R.S.C. the owner of the vessel was responsible for its removal and he was so advised. He was further advised that if he failed to remove, the work would be done by the Department of Marine and Fisheries at his expense as provided by the Statute. He failed to remove the vessel and consequently the department was obliged to attend to the work, charging the expense to the registered owner of the vessel.

3. Captain J. D. Weir, Superintendent of Construction, Agency Marine Department, Montreal, acting under instructions from the department through C. A. LeBel, acting agent.

4. The hull has been broken up and thrown away. Boilers and metal parts were scrapped and sold by tender.

5. $285.57.

OVERSEAS FORCES—ROLL OF ENLISTMENT.

On the Orders of the day being called:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Early in the session we were given to understand that the roll of enlistment of the soldiers would be laid upon the table of the House. Is the minister ready to bring it down to-day or before we prorogue?

Major General HUGHES: Some of the rolls are now prepared, but it was deemed advisable by the officers of the department not to publish any of them until they are all ready. I have not asked about the matter for the last day or two, but I understand the rolls are nearly completed now. The intention is to publish them, and they will of course be laid on the table of the House at the very earliest moment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Under ordinary circumstances that answer might be satisfactory, but I call the attention of the Government to the fact that we are now considering a Bill to give votes to the soldiers, and it seems to me that the publication of the names of the men to whom we give this vote ought to be concurrent with the coming into force of the Act.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will find out how far the roll is advanced and let my hon. friend know later on in the day. The delay I am informed is in the Printing Bureau, and I will ask the Secretary of State to have the printing expedited as much as possible. Of course, there will be distribution among the members of Parliament when the lists are ready.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Proulx: For a return showing: 1. The amount paid by the Department of Justice since the first day of December, 1907, to the Senior Judge of the united counties of Prescott and Russell for travelling allowance and transporta-

tion expenses in connection with the holding by him of Chambers in the city of Ottawa. 2. Where the said Judge has resided since the said date. 3. The present place of residence of the said Judge. 4. Whether it is the custom of the Department of Justice to pay to Judges travelling allowance and transportation expenses for holding Chambers at the place where they reside.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I ask the Prime Minister or the Minister of Railways and Canals if any Order in Council has been passed of late concerning either the payment of subsidies or giving a guarantee of bonds to the Quebec and Saguenay Railway? If so, has that Order in Council been laid upon the table of the House?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as I apprehend the hon. gentleman's question, there has been nothing passed of late on the subject.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the matter under consideration?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Everything that is not passed is under consideration.

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE.

Mr. VERVILLE: Is the Minister of Labour aware that campaign literature is being distributed from his department? If so, under what authority is it being done, and are the employees of his department working at it?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: This is an old story.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am not aware that such literature is being issued from my department, but if my hon. friend will give particulars concerning the matter I will look into it.

WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. VERVILLE: I would like to ask the Minister of Labour if I can have an answer to question 11, which is as follows:

1. Is the Government aware that the Western Union Telegraph Company is said to control the Great North Western Telegraph Company, which, since the 1st January, 1915, is the name under which the amalgamation of the Great North Western and the Canadian Northern Telegraph Companies is carried out?

2. If not, can the Government indicate to what authorities application should be made for such information?

[Mr. Proulx.]

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think it is a proper question, because my department is not supposed to keep in touch with private enterprises of this kind. We have had some correspondence making complaints against these companies, and I shall be glad to let my hon. friend know the substance of that correspondence; but we do not keep track of the information required by this question, and we do not indicate to members of this House where they can get information concerning private enterprises.

Mr. SPEAKER: My attention has been drawn to this question, and in my judgment it is not a proper question to put on the Order Paper and it is not in the proper form. The rule is laid down that members putting questions on the Order Paper become responsible for the allegations of facts in them, which is certainly not done here. A question should also refer to something in connection with the business of the House or of the country with which the Government is dealing, which does not seem to me to be the case in regard to this question.

CANADA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce), the House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 112, to amend the Canada Grain Act.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Bill, which was sent up from the House to the Senate and which has been returned with these amendments, was very carefully thought out and thoroughly discussed in the House, and it was sent to the Senate as it had been thought out and as the consensus of opinion in the committee and in the House after it was discussed seemed to dictate. The Senate, however, has fallen foul of one of the sections and has altered it by striking out the word "shippers." This amendment was moved in the House, but it did not seem to receive the assent of the House and was not even pressed to a vote. It, however, has been revived in the Senate and is now part of the Bill as the Senate has returned it to the Commons. It destroys the full efficiency of the Bill and will hamper the work of the department to the extent that this interest is left out of the powers that are to be given by this legislation to the Grain Commission. At this late time, however, I suppose it is better to take a mutilated Bill than to have no-

thing at all, and with the determination to work it out as well as we can under what has been sent back to us from the Senate, I propose to let the matter go. I move that the amendments be concurred in.

Amendments concurred in.

SOLDIERS' VOTING BILL.

The House again in Committee, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair, on Bill No. 111, to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise.—Mr. Doherty.

On section 4, subsection 6—holding polls:

Mr. DOHERTY: When this subsection was allowed to stand, it was after certain suggestions had been made with regard to making some matters that might be considered to be covered by it perfectly clear, one of them being that the volunteer presenting himself at the poll to vote should be subject to being called upon to be sworn then and there. A second thing that was pointed out was that while subsection 6 does provide by reference to the Dominion Elections Act for agents, or what are called scrutineers, to be present at the polls, in view of the circumstances in which the votes will be taken and of the fact that they may be taken for more than one electoral district, it is desirable to provide that agents may be present at the polls as agents, not necessarily exclusively of any one candidate, but of all candidates of the party for which they are appointed scrutineers.

Finally, it was suggested that it would be wise that we should put in a provision to require the military authorities of the different camps to give all possible facilities for the holding of the polls. To meet these three suggestions, I have prepared amendments. I move that subsection 6 of section 4 be amended by adding thereto:

"6a. Any volunteer presenting himself to vote shall, if so required, even though his name be upon the list prepared by the camp returning officer, take the oath contained in form B of this Act and in form Y of the Dominion Elections Act, and if his claim to vote rests upon his having been a qualified elector in any electoral district at the time of his enlistment or appointment, any other oath which under the Dominion Elections Act may be required to be taken by voters generally claiming a like qualification.

"6b. In addition to agents who may be appointed in accordance with the Dominion Elections Act to represent candidates at the poll, agents may be appointed on behalf of either the Government or the Opposition and such agents shall have all the powers of agents of candidates under the said Act and be entitled to exercise the said powers on behalf of all candidates in all electoral districts for the party by which such agents have been named and any person or persons named as agent or agents of any candidate of a party shall be entitled to act as agent or agents of any other candidate of the same party in any electoral district or districts.

"6c. The military authorities at every camp or base where a poll is to be held as aforesaid shall afford to the camp returning officer all necessary facilities for the holding of the same."

The effect will be to make it quite clear that the volunteer may be sworn both according to form B and according to form Y, the latter being against disqualification or any corrupt act on his part or exercised upon him, and also any further oath under the Dominion Elections Act which may be required of those claiming like qualification.

Mr. OLIVER: Last night I understood the minister to say that he would propose an amendment that would make it absolutely clear that the voter had a right to vote although his name was not on the list prepared by the returning officer. Has that been done? Is it the intention to make that provision?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no objection to it now, but it seemed to me that, inasmuch as there is absolutely nothing here to make the presence of the name on the lists that the returning officer provides an essential condition of voting, what the hon. gentleman desires would necessarily follow. I confess I overlooked the matter in preparing the amendments, but I have no objection to providing it. I move:

That subsection 4 of section 4 be amended by adding thereto the words:

"The failure of the volunteer to present his claim in time to be entered on such list, and the consequent absence of his name from such list, shall not deprive such volunteer of his right to vote, provided he presents himself to the returning officer and takes the oath above prescribed before the poll is closed."

Mr. OLIVER: Will the words, "oath above prescribed," preclude the possibility of his being required to take the qualification and bribery oath?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think so. This provides that the mere absence of his name from the list shall not preclude his voting, provided he takes the oath entitling him to get on the list. That being dealt with, I think he fairly comes under the provisions of subsection 6, which requires him to present himself to the returning officer and make before the returning officer an affi-

davit which will entitle him to get on the list. The words, "any volunteer presenting himself to vote," will apply to that man when he presents himself to vote just as it will apply to the man whose name was on the list.

Mr. OLIVER: So long as there is no confusion, I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. MACDONALD: With regard to the amendment proposed by the minister respecting the furnishing of facilities by the camp commandant to the returning officer of the poll, the minister will remember that last night I suggested that a provision should be inserted requiring the camp commandant to give all volunteers in camp an opportunity to poll their votes. I pointed out the difficulty that might arise if a man were employed at some work which might prevent him from voting. Perhaps the minister could add some apt words which would make provision for this.

Mr. DOHERTY: I did not understand that the desire was that we should impose an obligation on them to allow the men to vote, because I take it that it is not desirable that we should require the military authorities to allow a man to absent himself from essential duties for the purpose of voting. However, I would have no objection to meeting the hon. gentleman's view.

Mr. MACDONALD: We are dealing only with Canadian camps in this case, and I see no reason, unless it be confinement for some offence, why every man in the camp should not be permitted to vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that the desire would be met if we added to subsection 6c the following words:

> And the officer commanding shall allow every volunteer, so far as it may be done consistently with the proper performance of his military duties, time and opportunity to vote.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. DOHERTY: Having given consideration to what was pointed out last evening by the hon. member for Pictou, I beg to move that subsection 9 of section 4 be struck out.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 10—when voter cannot vote under this Act:

Mr. MACDONALD: Why is it provided that a volunteer, if within 25 miles of his polling place, shall not vote elsewhere than at said polling place? I do not see why he should not vote in camp?

Mr. DOHERTY: It seemed to us that a soldier who was at home, in his own electoral district, should not be entitled to vote in camp under the special provisions made for soldiers, instead of in the regular way at his proper voting place.

Mr. NESBITT: Why not use the words "in his own electoral district"?

Mr. DOHERTY: In order that the section should apply to him two conditions are necessary, being within his own electoral district and not being more than twenty-five miles away from his regular polling place. I may say that unless this section appears to members of the committee to be of more importance than it does to me, I am prepared to drop it altogether. It was inserted because it seemed to be a logical section to insert. I would move that section 10 be dropped.

Motion agreed to, and section 10 struck out.

On schedule A—ballot:

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister decided to place any additional words on the ballot?

Mr. DOHERTY: I cannot at the moment lay my hand on the form of ballot to be used. We desire to have a ballot as much like the regular ballot as possible. I understood that the hon. member wished to have the words "I vote for, etc." printed in French as well as in English. That is being done.

Mr. MARCIL: They always are in Quebec.

Mr. DOHERTY: Not on the face of the ballot. Such printing as there is is on the back of the ballot.

Mr. MARCIL: I am not insisting on that. I thought the minister might put in some such words as "Dominion general elections."

Mr. DOHERTY: The existing law prescribes that the ballot, save for the white spaces where the names of the candidates are placed, shall be entirely black. There is no space on the ballot on which you could print "Dominion general elections."

Mr. MARCIL: If the minister is satisfied, all right.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister will observe that in the printed instructions on the margin of the ballot it is said that "the

voter shall write the name of such person in the first space." Should it not be " such person or persons " so as to cover several constituencies like Halifax, St. John, Ottawa and others?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no objection. My impression was that inasmuch as under the Dominion Elections Act a man is entitled to vote for as many candidates as there are persons to be elected you might say that a man might vote for " such person " and that that would cover any cases where there are more than one, because each one of these persons would be " such person." However, there is nothing like being perfectly clear, and I have no objection. But, we perhaps might create a situation where, for the purpose of being absolutely clear about one or two constituencies, we might mislead voters in the great bulk of constituencies by telling them they could vote for " such person." I think it would be safer to leave it as it is. Of course, instructions will go with the ballots.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Very well.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The ballots in the French-Canadian constituencies in the province of Quebec are usually printed in French. The returning officer knows the nationality of the majority of the electorate.

Mr. DOHERTY: When the ballots are issued there is nothing printed on them except the names of the candidates, which, if they are French are printed in French, and if English, are printed in English.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I mean the instructions.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are no instructions printed on the ballot paper. In conformity with the suggestion of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) I have put in an amendment that the instructions on the ballot shall be printed both in French and English, and also that all the words on the face of the ballot-form be printed in both languages.

Mr. LEMIEUX: All right.

On schedule B—affidavit:

Mr. NESBITT: There are numerous cases where these men come from outside an electoral district in which they enlisted, and perhaps in the electoral district only three or four days or a week before enlistment. That precludes their taking the oath that they have been thirty days there. How would that affect them?

Mr. DOHERTY: As the Bill now reads a man is entitled to vote in the electoral district in which he last resided for a period of thirty days within the six months previous to his enlistment.

Mr. NESBITT: No, it is the thirty days preceding.

Mr. DOHERTY: No, we have cleared away any question of its being immediately preceding.

Mr. GERMAN: The words in the affidavit are: "the last place in which I was resident for thirty days." Does not that point out to the voter that he must have resided thirty days in one place immediately prior to his enlistment?

Mr. NESBITT: That is the way I read it.

Mr. GERMAN: It seems to me that that is the way it has to be interpreted.

Mr. DOHERTY: No, if a man states the last place within which he has lived for thirty days during the last six months, he does not say anything about it being the thirty days immediately preceding his enlistment. It may be that within six months a certain place is the only place in which he had resided for thirty days, and he may have resided there four months ago. I do not quite see why it is inferred that because a man has to say where, during the last six months, he last lived for thirty days it means the last place in which he has lived for a shorter period.

Mr. GERMAN: He must give the particular place in which he lived for thirty days within the six months?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: I want to call the minister's attention to the fact that there are a number of Canadian officers who have taken commissions in British regular regiments. Most of them are surplus officers who went over with the first contingent. From New Brunswick we have five such officers. I understand that there are 75 or 80 officers, or non-commissioned officers, who have taken commissions. It would be desirable to give these men a chance to vote and it might be done by inserting a provision in the Bill that Canadian officers with temporary commissions in the regular service may apply to the High Commissioner for affidavits and ballots, and, upon their being marked, may send the affidavits and ballots to the High Commissioner to be forwarded by him. It would give them an opportunity to vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is unfortunate that these individual gentlemen should lose their opportunity to vote, but on the other hand I think we are doing our full duty when we endeavour to provide for the members of the Canadian expeditionary force. To go outside and select a few people who have gone into the regular British army, and are not connected with the Canadian force, and try to provide a further method for their voting, is endeavouring to get a degree of perfection that will expose us to possible complications that the results would hardly justify. There are officers who are Canadians in some of the forces of the Allied armies, and it would be difficult for us to make the same provision for them. Upon the whole, I think that, having made a provision that seems adequately to cover the Canadian expeditionary force, it will probably be wiser for us not to endeavour to extend it further.

On the preamble:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Before the Bill is reported, I would ask the Minister of Justice if he persists in his intention that no notice shall be given of the time when and the place where the vote is to be taken by any officer.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What does my hon. friend suggest?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Each officer, whether a commanding officer, a captain, or a sergeant, will have a certain number of men in his unit, who are to vote, and my suggestion is that notice should be given that on such a day and at such a place he will proceed to receive these votes. Otherwise, a man could come in and vote one day, another man to-morrow, another man the next day, and so on. What I had in mind was that notice should be given to those who are entitled to vote before such an officer, that on such a day and at such a place he would receive their votes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would be very difficult to collect them all at the one place and on the same day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not deny that it is difficult, but it is only one of the difficulties surrounding this measure.

Mr. MARCIL: There would be no difficulty on that score in Canada, or in Bermuda, or in England. If the vote is to be allowed at all in France or in Belgium, I am sure the commanding officers could arrange to have some one representing the parties present. All that we on this side of the House want is that the vote coming from the firing line should be an honest vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: I desire to point out that when mention was made of my having refused yesterday to allow notice to be given, we were discussing a plan of official scrutineers, and what I was unwilling to undertake was that it should be an obligation of the officer taking the votes to see that the scrutineers were notified. It seems to me that if that system could be worked out, it would be more proper to require diligence on the part of the scrutineer to attend on the officer than to lay an obligation on the officer to run after the scrutineer. In order to meet a view in which I concurred, that is, that so far as possible we shall provide for observation of the operation of taking the votes, I desire to move:

That subsection 4 of section 2 be reconsidered for the purpose of adding thereto the following words:

"In cases where conditions make it possible, the officer empowered to receive affidavits and votes shall give notice of the time and place where he will receive such affidavits and votes, and shall permit any one officer, non commissioner officer or soldier who may desire to do so, to be present at said operations and act as agent of the respective parties, Government and Opposition, and any independent candidate, in the same manner as agents of candidates are empowered to act at a poll under the Dominion Elections Act. No volunteer who is entitled to vote and prevented by his military duties from voting at such time and place shall, however, be precluded from so doing at same other time and place."

I think, as we have allowed for the possibility of a voter voting for an independent candidate, it might be well to allow representation of such possible independent candidate.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER: According to the wording in the beginning of section 4, a returning officer is to be appointed at each military camp or base. At Edmonton there are two regiments of infantry occupying military buildings. In the case of the squadron, which is on the south side of the river, its base is at Medicine Hat; but it has the use of the armoury at Edmonton, and the men are billeted amongst the citizens. Would this be considered as a camp, and would this force have a returning officer under the interpretation of this section?

Mr. DOHERTY: I would feel that it ought to be treated as such. To remove

all doubt I have no objection to putting in a section that shall interpret the word "camp."

Mr. OLIVER: If the word "base" were not used, the word "camp" would cover everything, but when the word base is used and when the men are not at their base and not at their camp there is confusion.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are conditions under which soldiers would not be in a camp. But we can interpret the word "camp." We struck out section 10. I move that the following be enacted as section 10 of the Bill:

"In this Act the word 'camp' shall include any barrack or barracks or other place where any unit or units are assembled for the purpose of military duties under a commanding officer."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY: May I ask if there has been any change in the title of the Bill? In this corrected reprint it is entitled, "An Act to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise." But the Bill as it now stands enables others than Canadians to exercise their electoral franchise—for instance, persons in the British islands or other overseas Dominions who come within section 1.

Mr. DOHERTY: They must form part of the Canadian military forces.

Mr. MURPHY: But it says "to enable Canadians."

Mr. DOHERTY: They are persons enlisted in Canada.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, but they are not Canadians. I think the title should be amended to meet the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: Suppose we said "Canadian soldiers." I think that would describe them correctly. Whatever they may be as to nationality, when they join the Canadian permanent force or the Canadian expeditionary force, they are certainly correctly described as Canadian soldiers.

Mr. MURPHY: Would it not be more correct to say "to enable persons serving in the military service of Canada"?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A better wording, perhaps, would be, "to enable persons serving in the Canadian military forces." But I may remind my hon. friend that the title is dealt with on the third reading.

Bill as amended reported.

Mr. DOHERTY moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I move in amendment:

That this Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by striking out section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The Governor in Council shall appoint two commissioners for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, one of whom shall be nominated by the Prime Minister and one by the leader of the Opposition, within ten days after the passing hereof. And on failure of either the Prime Minister or the leader of the Opposition to make such nomination, the Governor in Council may make the appointment of the commissioner which either of such parties so failed to nominate. The said commissioners so appointed shall appoint a third commissioner within ten days of their being notified by the Governor in Council of their appointment, and should they fail to agree on such third commissioner, such third commissioner shall on the request of either or both of the said two commissioners be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. In case of the death, resignation or refusal to act at any time of either of such commissioners his place shall be filled in manner hereinbefore prescribed for the appointment of the said commissioner who so died, resigned or refused to act. The majority of the commissioners shall constitute a quorum and their acts shall be as legal and valid as the joint acts of the three commissioners.

"The said commissioners shall have power and it shall be their duty from time to time, to make all necessary regulations for the taking of the votes, the marking of the ballots, the taking of the affidavits of the voters and the transmission thereof to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and all procedure in connection therewith, so as to insure as far as possible that all persons entitled to vote hereunder shall have a fair and reasonable opportunity of doing so. Such regulation shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. And when they have been so approved they shall have the same force and effect as if they were enacted as a part of this Act.

"The commissioners shall have power to appoint such persons to act as scrutineers and otherwise to assist in carrying out the said regulations as the commissioners may deem necessary from time to time."

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The matter which the hon. gentleman has just brought to the attention of the House was debated very fully in committee, and reply was made by the hon. Minister of Justice to the arguments put forward in support of that suggestion. It is neither necessary nor desirable that these arguments should be repeated, and I hope that the hon. gentleman will not consider it discourteous if at this juncture we do not repeat them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The matter was fully discussed in committee; I did not intend that we should go into it now.

Amendment (Mr. Pugsley) negatived on division.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire to move, seconded by Mr. Lemieux:

That this Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions that they have power to amend the same by adding as subsection 11 of section 2 the following:

"11. No action shall be taken under the foregoing provisions of this section until the same have been submitted to and approved by the Secretary for War of the United Kingdom."

This matter was discussed fully in committee, in the absence of the Prime Minister, and I do not propose now to add anything in support of this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: As the hon. gentleman has already moved one amendment, he has exhausted his right to speak on the third reading. The amendment which he now proposes is, therefore, out of order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I beg to move this amendment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This matter also was fully discussed in committee, and it is not necessary nor desirable that we should add anything to the arguments which were made by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice in that respect. The only observation I desire to make is that the amendment as proposed, if carried into effect, would seem to constitute a very severe blow at the autonomy of Canada and the independence of this Parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not take the view which my right hon. friend takes, for this reason: this Bill imposes certain duties upon officers of the British Army. It is made imperative upon these officers that they shall deliver ballots to Canadian soldiers who are entitled to use them; that they shall take their affidavits; that they shall place the different ballots and affidavits in envelopes; that they shall seal these envelopes and forward them in packages to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. That is imposing duties upon Imperial officers over whom this Government and this Parliament have no control whatever. It would seem to me, therefore, that before any action should be taken in the way of attempting to have these officers assume the functions which are specified in the Bill and take upon themselves the obligations which, by the Bill, they are required to take, it is only reasonable that the consent of the Secretary of State for War, who has jurisdiction and control over all these officers, should first be obtained. I cannot see how that would in any way derogate from the dignity, authority or autonomy of this Parliament.

Amendment (Mr. Lemieux) negatived on division.

Mr. MARCIL: I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Sunbury and Queens (Mr. H. H. McLean):

That this Bill be not read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by striking out the words "twenty-one" in the first line of section one and by inserting the word "eighteen" in place thereof.

The House has already heard the arguments in support of this suggestion. I contend very respectfully that a man who has attained 18 years of age, who has undergone medical inspection, who is mentally and physically qualified to take up arms in the service of his country overseas, and who is willing to make the sacrifice of his life, if necessary, to defend the cause which he has at heart, should be on an equal footing with men of the age of 21. If the soldier who has attained the age of 21 years is to have the advantage of exercising the franchise, then it is an unjust and unfortunate discrimination that others who are serving their country should be deprived of that right. I think that this view will appeal to the whole of young Canada, which is taking a deep and patriotic interest in this matter.

Amendment (Mr. Marcil) negatived on division.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg to move that the title of the Bill be as follows: An Act to enable Canadian Soldiers on Active Military Service During the Present War to Exercise their Electoral Franchise.

Motion agreed to.

Main motion (Mr. Doherty) agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed

At one o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, a report was made by the Public Accounts Committee yesterday and the House has not yet concurred in that report. It was in-

tended to have made the usual motion for concurrence this morning, but I asked that it might be postponed, as I desired to make a statement in respect of it, having regard to the fact that the report or reports concerned contain some matter that demands the serious consideration of the Government. It would be possible to allow it to stand until to-morrow morning; but I would suggest, if the House has no objection, that the motion be taken at eight o'clock this evening for the purpose of having it disposed of and for the further purpose of giving me an opportunity to make the statement to which I have alluded. I would therefore move, if the House will consent, that motions shall be taken at eight o'clock this evening.

Motion agreed to.

WAR TAX STAMPS.

Mr. BUREAU: I wish to ask a question of the Postmaster General. I have here one of the new war-tax stamps for cheques, notes, etc., and I see it is exactly similar to the ordinary postage stamp, with the words "Canada postage" printed on it in the usual way, but with the words "war tax" on it. Is this special war tax stamp good for the payment of postage on a letter in the ordinary way? I was told in one of the banks this morning that a number of letters were returned to them yesterday—that the boys had, by inadvertence, placed the stamps marked war tax on them and that they were refused at the central post office. I understand that the ordinary postage stamp is good for payment of the special war tax. Is it also true that the war stamp is good for ordinary postage? If not, great confusion may result owing to the close resemblance between the two stamps.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am not prepared to make a statement yet, but if the hon. gentleman will allow the question to stand until eight o'clock I shall reply fully. My impression is that the war-tax stamp is not available for the ordinary postage of letters.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

REPORT OF MR. T. R. FERGUSON.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton) asked for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the report of Mr. T. R. Ferguson regarding the Department of the Interior.

And leave having been granted, he said:

Mr. Speaker, there have been laid upon the table of the House within the past few days certain reports made by one T. R. Ferguson, who was appointed a commissioner by Order in Council, which has also been placed on the table. In order that the House may be aware of the scope of the inquiry, it may perhaps be as well to read, in whole or in part, the orders under which Mr. Ferguson worked. There are two. The first of these is dated the 10th of May, 1913, passed under the Inquiries Act of 1906, and appoints Mr. Ferguson a commissioner.

> —to investigate and report upon all matters connected with the sale, lease, grant, exchange or disposition by any means whatsoever, since the 1st day of July, 1896, of (a) Dominion lands, (b) timber and mineral lands and mining rights and privileges, including coal, petroleum and gas lands and rights; (c) water-powers and rights, under the authority or purporting to be under authority of the Dominion Lands Act, Irrigation Act, or other statutes of the Parliament of Canada.

It will be observed that this gives Mr. Ferguson a fairly comprehensive range of activity, but it did not seem to be considered adequate for the purposes in view; and so, on the 27th of June, 1913, the order was amended to provide that Mr. Ferguson be appointed a commissioner under Part I of the Inquiries Act:

> To investigate and report upon all matters relating to or connected with the application for (although such application may not have been granted or may be still pending), the sale, lease, grant, exchange or disposition by any means whatsoever, since the 1st day of July, 1896 of (a) Dominion lands; (b) timber and mineral lands and mining rights and privileges, including coal, petroleum and gas lands and rights and irrigation tracts or lands; and the cutting of timber upon Government lands; (c) water-powers and rights; (d) Indian lands and Indian reserves.

In pursuance of this authority, Mr. Ferguson entered upon his duties, and that he was more or less diligent in the performance of those duties may fairly be gathered from the reports showing the results of his efforts, which have been laid upon the table of the House in the past few days and are now before the House for their inspection and consideration. I may say, for information, that I understand that Mr. Ferguson's services were enlisted at a cost of approximately $30,000 in the way of salary and $10,000 for expenses. This report thus represents an outlay of approximately $40,000. So there is no question that Mr. Ferguson had an ample range of authority, and there is no doubt that he had plenty of financial backing; nor is there any doubt that he has volumes of documents to show

as the result of his activities. It would be ignoring the plain facts not to admit or take for granted that the purpose of Mr. Ferguson's appointment was to find actions that would be blameworthy on the part of myself as Minister of the Interior or on the part of my predecessor in that office. That, I take it, was the sole and only purpose of the appointment of Mr. Ferguson. No other reason, I think, can fairly be adduced.

As a result of this exhaustive examination that he has made, this unlimited investigation that he has been authorized to make, and that the country has paid for, certainly with unlimited liberality, I think I am safe in saying that both the Administration of my predecessor and that of myself have received at the hands of Mr. Ferguson what may be considered a very satisfactory certificate of character. There can be no doubt of the fact that Mr. Ferguson's investigations were prompted by political animus rather than by a sincere desire to secure the protection of the public interest. There have been many transactions of the Interior Department since 1896, but of all these thousands of transactions, we find by these reports that Mr. Ferguson has only dealt with the transactions that in some way are linked with the name of some person who is either a prominent Liberal in public life or a prominent official appointed by the Liberal Government. If Mr. Ferguson has not made any successful discoveries it certainly is not for want of authority, or for want of political animus. Besides that, it may be noted that while the second order that was issued to empower Mr. Ferguson to extend his inquiries was issued to enable him to take cognizance of unfinished transactions, and transactions entered upon by the Government of the day, there is no reference to any such transactions in any of these documents. Mr. Ferguson has confined himself almost entirely to transactions which already have been aired on the floor of Parliament, and to which, I am bound to say, his investigations have added very little in the way of information to the public.

While I do not wish to introduce a controversial attitude in the discussion of this report, I think it is only due to the country that it should be informed that this report, which obviously has been in large measure completed for a very long time, and I fancy has been entirely completed for a considerable time, was not presented to Parliament at a period of the session that would permit of a full and fair examination and discussion by Parliament or of such scrutiny as such an extensive and voluminous report would naturally be entitled to. It will be observed that while this report deals with matters concerning the operations of the Interior Department, no part of it was laid on the table of the House until the Estimates of the Department of the Interior and, may I say as well, the Estimates of the Department of Public Works had passed the House. Immediately those Estimates had passed, the volumes containing the report of the investigations began to be laid on the table. It is obvious that the animus on the part of the commissioner was behind the commissioner as well. It was not the intention of the Government that appointed that commission that the results of its work should be considered in Parliament fairly and impartially or that the questions arising under it should be discussed in Parliament as they should have been discussed and as they could only or best be discussed in Committee of the Whole House during the discussion of the Estimates of the department.

I have already said that there is no fault to find with the majority of the conclusions reached by Mr. Ferguson; but although there is not, these documents have been laid on the table of Parliament at a time when they do not admit of a reasonable measure of examination or discussion or consideration, but at a time when the public press has every opportunity to obtain knowledge of these documents and to place any construction it pleases upon any part of the matter contained. The Government laid itself out in the beginning to take all the advantage that lay in its hands, by reason of having control of the affairs of the country, and by reason of the Act providing for investigations in regard to public matters, and over, above and beyond that, they further took the strategical, practical, political, partisan and picayune advantage of bringing these documents before Parliament at a time when they cannot be properly considered or discussed, and at a time when all the political capital that can possibly be made out of them can be made out of them by the newspaper friends of our hon. friends on the other side of the House. I have no fault to find with the appointment of a commissioner to investigate the transactions of the Interior Department under my Administration or anybody else's administration. The transactions of the Interior Department are the business of the public, and the public have a right to be informed in

regard to those transactions. They have a right, especially, if there is any suspicion, and I have no doubt there was suspicion in the minds of our hon. friends opposite as to the character of the transactions involved. Therefore, I say that the Government had a perfect right to appoint a commissioner to make all the investigation that is possible or that they think is necessary. But they have no right, having done that, having invoked the extreme power of the law in protection of the public interest, to turn that to a petty, partisan advantage as they have done in the case of this report.

Now, dealing with the different separate reports, I will first take the one with which my name is particularly connected. I have here the report upon the matter, and it is described as:

> Re the Bulletin Company, Limited, the Honourable Frank Oliver, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Not to weary the House by going into any very great detail, I may say that the subject-matter of this report is the statement that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company hold $15,000 of stock in the Bulletin Company, Limited, in which company I also hold a large amount of stock, or the controlling interest; that is, the controlling interest is in my name. The Grand Trunk Pacific Company, some time about 1905 or 1906, took shares in that company to the amount of $15,000. I do not know that it is of interest either to the House or to the country what the financial operations of the Bulletin Company, Limited, may be; but on that point I may mention that the Bulletin newspaper was founded by me, became a limited liability company later, and was conducted upon lines suitable to the circumstances of the city and surrounding country up to the point when the great development began as a result of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and the extension of the Canadian Northern railway. About that time, I transferred my activities to Ottawa, in an endeavour to help along the interests of the country in the administration of the Interior Department, and naturally I left the Bulletin to take care of itself. If the newspaper was to continue its development in proportion to the changed circumstances of the country, it became necessary that it should have increased capital. A new company was formed, to which some of the leading citizens of Edmonton subscribed money, and to which it appears from the record that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company subscribed $15,000. I took shares for the interest I had in the company, and the business has gone on in that way ever since.

I do not know whether it would be of interest to the House and the country to know that the business has not been prosperous, and in all probability the Grand Trunk Pacific Company have lost their $15,000, as I have lost a good many thousand dollars also as a result of my connection with the Bulletin Company, Limited. I only allude to this because it is alluded to in this document.

I find further, on considering this document, that Mr. Ferguson apparently had in his mind the idea that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company had bought $15,000 worth of influence in the administration of the Interior Department, by taking this amount of stock in the Bulletin Company. I say that his purpose was to discover whether or not the Grand Trunk Pacific Company had bought $15,000 worth of influence in the Interior Department by taking this stock in the Bulletin Company, Limited; but after having made an exhaustive investigation, Mr. Ferguson does not find that. He did not find that the company had any influence in the administration of the Interior Department or he would have said so. He carefully does not say so, and what he says is:

> With regard to the propriety of the transaction as detailed herein, I do not know that it is necessary for me to comment upon the same at any length.

Now, after the evidence of animus that is shown throughout the transaction connected with the operations of Mr. Ferguson, after the investigation that he made as shown by his report, to find if the Grand Trunk Pacific had received advantage because of the ownership of stock in the Bulletin Company, after all his efforts he has not been able to find anything upon which he can hang even the suggestion of that influence, because if he had he would have said so. It was in order to enable him to say so that this country has paid between $36,000 and $40,000 for this report that is now lying before us. Mr. Ferguson says:

> Although I endeavoured to obtain some explanation from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company as to why it should, and did, go into this transaction, I have been unable to do so.

And he continues:

> As the evidence reveals in purchasing the stock the company was doing something which

was quite out of its usual line of business, and contrary to the custom of the company. That it was not regarded as of the nature of an investment would appear from the fact that the company, from the day of the purchase of the stock until the present time, has paid no attention to the affairs or management of the Bulletin Company, or attended any of its meetings, and no dividends have ever been received.

It was a mystery to Mr. Ferguson why the Grand Trunk Pacific Company desired to take stock in the Bulletin Company; I suppose it was just as much a mystery to him why a number of gentlemen in the city of Edmonton took stock in the Bulletin Company. But it was no mystery to anybody who knows the circumstances of the case. These men desired to see the newspaper expanded to correspond with the new conditions of the city, and I presume that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, being interested in Edmonton, as a junction and terminal point, felt a like interest and were willing to take stock for that purpose. But it makes no difference what the purpose of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company was, the result which Mr. Ferguson wished to find has been achieved or not achieved, and that is the only thing in which, as I understand it, the House and the country is concerned. It is too bad that Mr. Ferguson was disappointed to the extent he was; it is too bad that our friends on the other side of the House have not been able to get what they expected for their expenditure of the money of the country, but there is the report, and that is the only conclusion that can be drawn from it.

There is, however, something else that may be brought to the attention of the House in connection with this report, and it is this—I wish all members of the House to realize just what has been done in this case. The Government of Canada, in partisan pursuit of a political opponent, took the authority that is vested in them for the purpose of furthering the public interest, in order to establish an inquisitorial inquiry into the private business of a political opponent, as to a matter with which the Government of Canada had no more business to deal than it has to deal with the private business of any other political opponent. I will admit that if Mr. Ferguson had found any evidence of improper collusion between myself as Minister of the Interior and the Grand Trunk Pacific, then he would have been warranted in inquiring as to what relationship existed between us; but that was not where he started apparently. He started to inquire into the private business of the Bulletin Company,

Limited, as on the same principle he could start an inquiry into the private business of any private individual in this Dominion and expose that private business to the public gaze at the will, wish, suggestion or whim of the Government of the day. In my humble opinion, this is a most dangerous precedent and an action which will not find approval at the hands of the people of Canada. Power is vested in the hands of the Government for the purpose of protecting the public interest and not for the purpose of carrying on partisan warfare by methods which are generally relegated to porch-climbers or thugs. When the Government of Canada descends to that sort of political action, it disgraces Canada as well as itself. I do not fear any result that can be achieved by any Government of this country which chooses to make its fight supposedly in the public interest on any such principle, because, as is well-known by the members of this House, I have been the subject of blackmailing attacks for the past several years, and I do not think that those attacks have either done me any harm or done those who instigated them any good; and in so far as this attack, which is of the same character, goes, I think the result will be identical. When the Government of the day directs such an engine against a member of the Opposition, turning the authority of the Government into a means of political blackmail, it is establishing itself in a position of authority amongst even its own followers, and I think even its own followers will question the desirability of its existence. Supposing one of our hon. friends on the other side does not see eye to eye with the Government of the day on some important question, it is possible for the Government to appoint a commission of inquiry that will go into that man's private affairs, which may or may not be just as able to stand the light of day as the affairs of the Bulletin Company, Ltd., and to compel a loyalty of support on the part of its own followers that it is not entitled to receive and would not receive by reason of any other consideration. This principle of introducing blackmail into politics is a dangerous principle, and it is just as dangerous to supporters of the Government as it is to members of the Opposition.

I wish next to deal with the reference to my colleague, Mr. Cruise, the hon. member for Dauphin. Mr. Cruise moved for this report on the 15th of March; and although there is no doubt at all that the report was prepared at that time and had been prepared

months before, it was not brought down until after Mr. Cruise, believing that the business of the House was practically finished, had gone home, so that he is not here to answer for himself in regard to this report; but, as it contains some reflections upon Mr. Cruise and indirectly upon myself, I propose to have a word or two to say in regard to it. Broadly speaking, I may say that the accusation is that Mr. Cruise acquired a homestead on misrepresentation and without having fulfilled the duties, and that this occurred through the improper and lax administration of the officials of the Department of the Interior for which, of course, I was responsible. This accusation has gone out through the press to all parts of the country, this being the intention of Mr. Ferguson when he made his report and the intention of the Government when they held it until Mr. Cruise was absent and when they laid it on the table of the House at the time they did lay it.

What happened was this: The Riding Mountain Forest reserve had been set apart some years before by Order in Council or by departmental order, I do not know which. Owing to the fact that the reservation had not been carefully examined before being made, some parts of the area included were suitable for settlement, and squatters went on these parts. When by the Act of 1906, these reservations were made by statute, and a more careful examination was made of the forest conditions existing within them, a new line was drawn which excluded some quarters and included others in the reserve. It became necessary for the Government to take action to rid the reserve of those squatters who were inside of the boundaries, and to dispose under equitable conditions of the lands which had hitherto been reserved, but which were now excluded, and upon which there were some squatters. A Mr. Davis, who had been a forest ranger, was appointed to attend to this work, which of necessity must be handled on the ground and by personal examination. It was a difficult piece of work to do; we had to get rid of the squatters who remained on the permanent reserve, and we got rid of them by compensating them—by giving them other land largely in the area that was permanently cut out of the reserve. In dealing, then, with the lands that were out of the reserve, we gave precedence to the men who were in occupation as squatters, and then disposed of the remaining lands to applicants as they came forward. For some considerable period before the Government took the action that I have stated, there had been a movement on to these reserves. Some men went on and established permanent improvements and went into residence; some established temporary improvements and did not go into residence. When we were disposing of the land that had been taken out of the reserve, we considered claims as to priority of right of selection, so that it was necessary that a man should have actually resided or squatted upon the land while it was still in the reserve. If there were tangible, substantial improvements, we recognized that the owner of them had a prior right over somebody who had not improved. That was the position of Mr. Cruise. He is an old homesteader in the Dauphin district. He was entitled to a second homestead. Having hopes, as others had, that this area would be cut out of the Riding Mountain reserve, in order to establish a priority right, I presume, he caused the beginning of a building to the erected in 1906, while the land was still on the reserve. Then, when the land was cut out of the reserve, he applied for homestead rights upon this land, and was accorded these rights on the ground that he had improvements on the land prior to that time. Mr. Ferguson suggests that Mr. Cruise acquired these rights by fraud or misrepresentation. There is absolutely no warrant whatever for that statement.

Now, as to Mr. Cruise securing patent. He entered under the provision of proving up by the ranging of cattle upon the land. His permanent residence was within nine miles of the locality, so he did not need to be in actual residence in order to prove up. All he needed was twenty head of cattle upon that land. He had—so this evidence goes to show—only thirteen head of cattle of his own at that time. He bought seven head from a neighbour and gave a promissory note in payment; and on the strength of the ownership of these twenty cattle, he acquired patent for this land—absolutely, unquestionably in accordance with the letter of the law as it stood at that time. Mr. Ferguson does not think so. He thinks that Mr. Cruise did not get his patent according to the law. I say that that is a misrepresentation on the part of Mr. Ferguson. And it is neither more nor less than an outrage on the part of this Government, that after having such a report in their hands, and it having been asked for by the member affected by it, they did not bring it forward when they

had it there, and give him a chance on the floor of this House to state his actual position in regard to it. I may say that the use of cattle for the purpose of proving up the right of homestead was subject to abuse, and there were cases in which, while the letter of the law was fulfilled, the spirit was not fulfilled. And because of that, in 1908, an amendment was made in the law abolishing the right to prove up by ranging cattle on the homestead. This Government that appointed Mr. Ferguson and finds fault with Mr. Cruise for having proved up with cattle, absolutely within the terms of the law, has reinstated that provision so that anybody can prove up a homestead anywhere in the West exactly as Mr. Cruise proved up this homestead—can do it to-day. Mr. Ferguson concludes his report as follows:

> There does not appear to be a proper or adequate supervision of the grants for sale of public lands. If as suggested in other reports there had been a supervisor appointed who was reponsible for the legal and proper grant of each quarter-section granted, the frauds above mentioned could not have been perpetrated.

Mr. Davis was appointed as supervisor and had personal supervision and responsibility over and for these transactions. Mr. Ferguson uses the word "fraud" with a view to creating the impression that the country was in some way defrauded by the action of Mr. Davis. There was no fraud upon the country, in any way, shape or manner. The lands were there available for homestead, and the only question that is raised in the evidence offered by Mr. Ferguson is whether Mr. Davis gave due consideration to the rights of priority in the application made to these lands. It was a question between one applicant and another, and not between the applicants on one side and the country or the Government on the other. Mr. Ferguson has deliberately undertaken to create a false impression in regard to this case which has been taken advantage of by the newspapers supporting hon. gentlemen opposite. And I take the liberty of repeating that such a course is not politics, it is not partisanship, it is simply plain ordinary political brigandage.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is a little extravagant. I would remind him that it is not in order to impute an improper motive in what is done by an individual member of Parliament or by a number of members of Parliament collectively. Being an old member of the House, I naturally expect the hon. member not to be guilty of an infraction of the rules.

Mr. OLIVER: I intended this to apply to the commissioner and not to the House. I do not wish to trespass upon the rules but I wish to make a statement that can be understood. I have quoted the concluding paragraph of Mr. Ferguson's report for the purpose of showing that on his own statement there was absolutely no fault to find with the principle of the administration of the department's affairs by myself at that time and in that case. He does find fault with the details, but he declares that the principle that was followed was the right principle.

Here is a "report on, the Southern Alberta Land Company, Limited, and the Grand Forks Cattle Company, J. D. McGregor, Arthur Hitchcock and others." I do not pretend that I have been able to go through this report and to find out all that it says and all that it leaves unsaid. Being personally familiar, as administrator of the department at that time, with some matters connected with the Southern Alberta Land Company, I wish to make a short statement in regard to it. An application was made to the department for a tract of land for irrigation purposes. This tract was known to be in what is now recognized as the area of light rainfall in southern Alberta; that is to say, it was an area that was considered to be capable of development by irrigation. There was the land that needed irrigation to ensure its productivity, and there was sufficient water in the river for the purposes of irrigation. The company asked for a grant of that land, at a nominal price, on condition that they should put water upon it. They were given the right to put the water upon the land; in the effort to do that they have spent a very large amount of money, and the works are very close to completion. I shall not argue the merits of the proposition, or the principle on which it was founded. There is no question as to the propriety of the principle, and there is no question as to the soundness of the proposition. It is, beyond question, for reasons that technical men will understand, the best irrigation proposition in southern Alberta, because it includes a lake of warm water which is available to be turned on the land after it is warmed, as compared with the cold water of the river flowing directly through the irrigation ditches on to the land. A cursory glance through this report leads me to believe that Mr. Ferguson desires to create the impression that

these people should not have had the opportunity to spend their money upon this irrigation project. That is a matter with regard to which I at once take issue with him. I stand exactly by the principle that when these people came forward it was proper to allow them to spend their money in the development and irrigation of that land. As I understand it, they get title to the land only on consideration of their having developed it by irrigation. So convinced is this Government of the merit of and the desirability of completing this scheme, and of the bona fides of the company, that there is in the Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1916—item 490, under the heading "Dominion Lands and Parks"—the following item:

To provide for refund to the Southern Alberta Land Company, Limited, subject to security for repayment, with interest, upon terms arranged by authority of the Governor in Council, re-vote, $140,573.

I do not know what Mr. Ferguson has said about this project, but I am telling the House what the Government thinks of the desirability of completing it and what the Government thinks of the bona fides of the company.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it the same company?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, the Southern Alberta Land Company. The amount was voted last year, and revoted again this year.

I think it would be only losing time to read all that Mr. Ferguson has written in the conclusion of his report, but the final conclusion that he reaches is this:

After discussion of the matter with several experts of the United States of America, where irrigation has been very extensively carried on, that the proper method is that irrigation should be carried on under government supervision and control.

That may be very true, but the Government had not adopted the principle of government supervision at that time. The policy of the Government was to use the value of the land as a means of securing its development by irrigation, and in pursuance of that policy this arrangement with the Southern Alberta Land Company was entered into. As I say, it is being carried out by the company to the satisfaction of this Government, to the extent that they are willing to pay $140,000 to the company in assistance of their enterprise. I presume, however, that in all these pages Mr. Ferguson is desirous of creating the impression that the company should not have got the land. I presume, further, that his effort was to prove that in my administration of the department I had done some wrong to the country in allowing the company to spend their money by the million in that effort.

4 p.m.

Here is another irrigation proposition: the Aylwin Company, E. A. Robert and J. D. McGregor. This report is even bulkier than the former one, and I have not been able to go through it in its entirety. I have only a very indistinct recollection of this transaction, but as near as I can follow Mr. Ferguson's idea, while he desires to create the impression that the late Government acted unwisely and unjustly in giving the land to the Southern Alberta Company, he finds fault with the late Government for not having given the land to the Aylwin Company, because a large part of it was opened to homestead entry. That is as much as I can make out of his report. Apparently a man named Aylwin applied for an irrigation tract, making certain representations to the department as to his ability to put water on the land. Later it was found that he could not put water on the land—either the water was not there, or he could not get it—and as a consequence his right lapsed and part of the tract was opened up to homestead entry, and was actually homesteaded. Part of it was under grazing lease, and, I fancy, in consideration of whatever steps the Aylwin Company had taken, they were confirmed in their rights in so far as the grazing lease was concerned. They afterwards entered into a transaction with the Southern Alberta Land Company, and the Southern Alberta Land Company acquired the whole tract. Upon it, as I say, they have spent large sums of money, and of that enterprise the Government has substantially approved.

Mr. Ferguson reaches the sage conclusion:

I conclude by saying that this seems to have been really a granting of this particular tract to individual promoters, who looked for enrichment. That they did not make very large sums out of it, is no fault of theirs. If these applicants had been informed that the Government policy was such that they bind themselves to irrigate, that they would not be allowed to sell or dispose of their interests, that they must irrigate and begin the work and carry it on themselves, it is altogether likely they would never have endeavoured to acquire this tract. In such an event—in this case at any rate—these purchasers would not have acquired it, as they would necessarily have taken the trouble to learn, and have learned, that the tract could not be irrigated.

I find here a report: "On the matter known as the Craven dam—Walter Scott, Lieut. Governor Brown and J. G. Turriff.' If I am not trespassing on the rules of the House, I would like to say that after such perusal as I have been able to give this report I can find no reason whatever for making it the subject of an investigation by a commission, or of a Parliamentary report, except the desire to couple the names of Lieut. Governor Brown and Premier Walter Scott with an undesirable publicity at the hands of this gentleman, Mr. Ferguson. Mr. Brown purchased some lands from the department about the year 1900 at one dollar an acre. These lands were partially flooded lands. Afterwards, it appears, there was an Exchequer Court suit in connection with the lands and some parts of them were sold at $25 an acre. Mr. Ferguson goes through all these pages in an attempt to prove that because at one time the land was sold at one dollar an acre and was afterwards sold at $25 an acre, there was improper action on the part of Premier Scott or of Lieut. Governor Brown. I need not carry the argument any further; it is simply the height of absurdity, and I need not dwell upon it. As to the appreciation of the value of land, everybody knows that land increased in value enormously from 1900 until 1911, and even until 1912. I find in the report of the Deputy Minister of the Interior for 1914 a statement of the total sales and the average prices realized on lands sold by large companies in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta; and I find from this report that in the year 1900, which is about the time that Mr. Brown acquired these partially flooded and at the that time practically valueless lands, the average price was $3.27 an acre, while in 1914 the value per acre was $14.75 an acre. There has been that average appreciation in the selling value of lands in those prairie provinces. If you consider that the land bought by Governor Brown—remember, when he was a private citizen, when he was not Governor—as an adjunct to his ranch in 1900, because of its value for hay land, at a time when hay had no value and hay land was not considered valuable—if it is recognized that the most valuable land that could be sold by all companies, their selected lands, would bring only $3.27 per acre,—Mr. Brown was paying a fair price for land of the character that he bought. On the other hand, with the appreciation of the general value of land and particularly the appreciation of the value of hay land because of the closeness of settlement in the country, there is nothing whatever to warrant the suggestions put forward by Mr. Ferguson either that Mr. Brown got the land at less than its value in the first place or that he sold it at more than its value in the second place; and this was an absolutely gratuitous supposition on the part of Mr. Ferguson for the purpose of prejudicing a prominent political opponent. I am informed that part of this land, before Mr. Brown acquired it, had been homesteaded and had been abandoned by the homesteaders because it was not considered valuable. As a matter of fact, hundreds of thousands of acres of land, the property of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Colonization Company, in the immediate vicinity of this very land, was sold at $1.10 per acre in, I believe, 1902 or 1903—land that was not hay land or of low value, but land that was considered to be of good average value. But see what Mr. Ferguson says:

> These extracts from Mr. Brown's evidence, are a justification of the comments and statements I make as to the value of the lands when sold to him. The Crown should have received very considerably more than $1 per acre. I must take it that Mr. Brown did not mean the statements contained in his two letters as to the value of the lands. They were not made upon oath, and I accept the statements upon oath showing his idea of the time value of these lands. My conclusion therefore, is:
>
> First; that instead of producing very little hay, these lands produced on an average two tons per acre per annum.
>
> Second; that instead of being of very little value, these lands were worth as found on expropriation proceedings, at any rate $25 per acre.
>
> Further comment on Mr. Brown's evidence is unnecessary. It speaks for itself.

I will interpolate the idea that further comment on Mr. Ferguson's statement is not necessary: it speaks for itself.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When was the land expropriated ?

Mr. OLIVER: I think about 1910.

I find here a "report on a grazing ranch J. G. Turriff, A. J. Adamson and J. D. McGregor." This transaction was ventilated in the House of Commons a number of years ago. I do not think anything new is added in this report to what was said in the House at that time. I take it that Mr. Ferguson makes this report simply for the purpose of bringing into undesirable prominence the name of my friend and colleague, the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and for no other

reason that can be conceived. The transaction relates to a grazing lease, application for which was made by one Brown. The application was made at a time when closed grazing leases were allowed; that is, they were closed for 21 years. In some way Brown's application did not go through. After I became minister, I cancelled the regulations providing for closed leases for 21 years and provided that all 21-year closed leases should be cancellable on two years' notice. The applicants pressed for the granting of their lease. I decided that as we were trying to clear off the conditions that had existed up to that time in regard to closed leases, and as we were trying to establish new conditions, it was desirable that we should do so having regard to the rights already existing. I granted, as the evidence will show, a closed lease to the people who were the assigns of Brown. I do not know whether it was in the name of these gentlemen or not, but we will assume that it was. These men became the beneficial owners of Brown's application under the action I took, under the principles I laid down and the principles upon which I acted. We were making a very sudden and radical change in grazing regulations. We had to get the acceptance and approval of the people of the West to that change, and in order to get that acceptance it was desirable to clear off all existing or vested rights. I have no doubt that if we had taken the action that has been taken by our friends on the other side of the House in dealing with some of their political opponents, we would have said to every man whose lease had not been closed up: There is nothing doing; you are through. We did not do that, and I do not think it is good policy on the part of our friends opposite to do it; however, that is their business. We have granted this as a closed lease because application had been made for it, and the conditions in a certain measure had been fulfilled and the law was that closed leases could be had. Mr. Ferguson says that we did not charge the $2,400 rental that we should have charged these parties. That may be true, but on the other hand, the parties had not had the beneficial use of the lease during that time. There may have been an undue leniency in regard to the $2,400, and on the other hand there may not have been. I do not know that this Government is absolutely justified in taking $2,400 out of a private individual unless that private individual has had reasonable value for the money. Since it is a question that was in dispute, since it was awaiting adjudication, and since it needed further consideration, I am not prepared to admit that we should have charged that rental, although I am quite prepared to admit that we could have done so if we had seen fit. Mr. Ferguson's conclusion is:

> All of which goes to show the necessity for great care and attention in the carrying out not only departmental detail, but in guarding against errors and misunderstanding of those unfamiliar with the file, justifying my suggestions in other reports relative to the appointment of a supervisor of the different steps taken in different matters in the department.

That is his conclusion in regard to what has been heralded through the country by the press supporting our friends on the other side of the House as a most iniquitous transaction.

I find here a report on timber berths, with the names of W. H. Nolan, A. W. Fraser, K.C., and J. G. Turriff. I do not recall that this was under my administration, and I will leave this report for my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) to deal with.

Here are two cases: The Kananaskis Coal Company, Limited, with the names of Howard Douglas, George E. Hunter and Walter Carret and others, and timber berths 550-558. As far as I have been able to gather from a glance through these reports, there is no suggestion that these people got anything that they did not pay for. The suggestion is, that being officers of the Government, they had no right, and they should not have been permitted to deal in Government property. With that contention I have no fault to find, and in so far as my administration was concerned, certainly I did not permit officers of the department to have transactions in the property of the Government. But it is only fair to these parties to point out that the business of the Department of the Interior increased in magnitude and value very rapidly from year to year during the period immediately before I became minister and while I was minister. Dealing with these questions from the point of view of the conditions as they prevailed in 1911, it is not fair to consider them from the point of view of the conditions that prevailed in 1900 or 1896. What was of little value in 1896 became three, four, five, six or ten times as valuable in 1911. From time to time it became necessary in the administration of the affairs of the Department of the Interior to make a change to meet the new conditions. What was

quite permissible in years before ceased to be permissible as values and interests increased. When these men acquired these properties, in so far as I can say, they acquired them either by themselves or by assignment from other people who had acquired them in the ordinary way, and it has yet to be shown that the public interest suffered in any degree.

The first charge is that the men themselves should not have dealt with Government property. With that conclusion I have no fault to find, and as far as my knowledge went no member of the department did deal in Government property while I was minister. The connection of these men with the department had ceased, the connection of some of them having ceased before I was minister, and if there is any justice in the matter, justice has been done and there was no necessity in the wide world in the public interest of dragging these men's names, in an undesirable connection, before the Parliament and people of Canada, or of spending the money of the people in going over cases that were already settled and in regard to which the commissioner makes no suggestion as to any other action to be taken.

I find a report here: "re the Blood Indian Reserve and Frank Pedley." Frank Pedley was Deputy Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, and as nearly as I can gather from what I see here, about 1903, before I became minister, a lease of the grazing rights on the Blood Indian Reserve was granted to one McEwan, of Brandon. McEwan afterwards took into his interest in the grazing lease Peter Ryan of Toronto, and Gordon, Ironsides, and Fares, of Winnipeg. There is no question about the propriety of the lease. These people agreed to pay $5,000 a year for the grazing rights; they paid the money, and it was a sound business transaction from start to finish so far as I understand it. Gordon, Ironsides and Fares, were great cattlemen; they needed the grazing lands; the Indians were not using them; and it was good business to lease the grazing rights in these reserves to somebody who would use the lands and give the Indians the financial benefits of that use. That was the transaction, and that was what was done.

There is no question about the responsibility of the parties concerned; there is no question as to the fact that they paid a fair price for what they got; but this whole report is an attempt to prove that Frank Pedley had some financial interest in the transaction. Frank Pedley is not in the department to-day; he has nothing whatever to do with the affairs of this country, and there was no sound reason in the world for Mr. Ferguson spending his time on this report, or no sound reason in the world for laying this report on the table of Parliament, except the partisan reason to make party politics pending a general election that the Government is ashamed to announce they are going to hold. Pedley's connection with this, so he informs me, was this: Peter Ryan, one of the lessees of this reserve owed Pedley money, or he owed the Bank of Commerce money upon Pedley's endorsation; that is, Pedley had endorsed Ryan's paper in the Bank of Commerce, and this occurred before there was any lease at all. Later on the Bank of Commerce pressed for payment and Ryan assigned a part of his interest in the lease to one Bedford Jones. Jones sold the interest to one Miller for $1,000, and the money was applied to reduce Ryan's indebtedness to the Bank of Commerce. And for that reason Mr. Pedley's name must be dragged through the columns of the Conservative press in this country, in terms that would certainly not be more than justified if Mr. Pedley were a horse-thief instead of a respectable citizen, who did good service to this country as Deputy Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, and who has no reason not to look any man in the eye, let it be the Prime Minister of Canada or Mr. T. R. Ferguson.

Mr. J. D. REID: Does the report show that Mr. Pedley got nothing out of it?

Mr. OLIVER: I have been trying to tell my hon. friend that.

Mr. REID: Does it show that he only got a thousand dollars?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: He admits that he got more.

Mr. OLIVER: I have stated what I have been able to gather from this report. This shows the unfairness of putting these reports upon the table at this time of the session, and I hope I shall not be declared out of order when I say that if my hon. friends opposite choose to take that course they must take the logical consequence of it, which is, that they have taken an undue and partisan advantage which is not to their credit nor to the benefit of good government in this country. It is not right that an attempt should be made to use the vast authority of the Government of

Canada to pillory any honest citizen before the people of this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do I understand the hon. member to say that the $1,000 was used to reduce Mr. Ryan's indebtedness to Mr. Pedley?

Mr. OLIVER: I said it was used to reduce his indebtedness to the Bank of Commerce.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then my hon. friend has not read the report.

Mr. OLIVER: Perhaps I have not read it as carefully as the Solicitor General has, but if he had an opportunity to read it, would it not have been decent to place it on the table and let the rest of us have an opportunity to read it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There will be no hurry; we can stay here a week if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. OLIVER: I thank the Solicitor General for the suggestion, and it is a fair sample of the kind of politics that is being played by gentlemen on the other side of the House. We have closed up the business of the session, we have transacted all the business the Government has offered us, we have voted the Supplies, we have passed all the legislation, and now the Solicitor General throws upon the table a pile of documents which apparently he has carefully studied, and he says: If you want a fair discussion on this, all you have to do is to prolong the session, with no other business before Parliament than the discussion of this subject. The Solicitor General can campaign the country during the coming general election on that policy, and I do not think he will get very far with it.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Is the hon. member aware that Mr. Pedley was examined before Mr. Ferguson some time ago?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: And the hon. gentleman learned from Mr. Pedley the result of the inquiry?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: And so the hon. gentleman is not surprised to-day?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not surprised to-day; but I have not had time to read the report. I have merely been able to give Mr. Pedley's side of the story.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman knows, then, what is alleged against Mr. Pedley as related by Mr. Pedley himself, and that took place some months ago. Do I understand from the hon. gentleman that Mr. Pedley did not acquaint him with the investigation?

Mr. OLIVER: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Then, if the hon. gentleman never heard from Mr. Pedley anything about it, he is taken by surprise to-day.

Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Ferguson's report with regard to Mr. Pedley came down here two or three days ago, and I happened to meet Mr. Pedley, and I asked him about it. I had not read the report; I had not seen it. He gave me what I have given to the House, and I am prepared to take his word in regard to that quite as much as that of Mr. Ferguson, or any other hired thug such as he is.

I find another report here on "Indian lands; re James A. Smart, Frank Pedley, and William J. White." Of course the major part of the transactions alluded to in this report took place before I was minister, and again I say I have not had an opportunity of considering them very carefully. As I gather, the allegation is that Smart, Pedley and White—Smart being Deputy Minister of the Interior, and Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, Pedley being Superintendent of Immigration, and White being a subordinate officer in the Immigration Department—formed a company of some kind to acquire Indian lands. Now, I have already said that on the question of the interference of officers of the Government in the property of the people I do not suggest for a moment justification for that action. I have pointed out that as conditions changed, what was permissible at one time became unpermitted at another time, and, whatever occurred, two of these gentlemen are out of the service of the Government to-day; one of them was out of it before I became minister at all, and he was the only one who had anything to do with the Indian Department and the third man is still in the service of the Government.

As far as I have been able to follow the report, there is no suggestion that these men in purchasing Indian lands got an acre of them for less than its full value; they paid dollar for dollar for everything that they got. That being the case, the Indian got what was coming to him; the country is discharged of its obligation to the Indian inasmuch as he got all that was coming to him, and the only question at issue is the

propriety of Government officials meddling with public property. In regard to that matter, there is nothing in the report to indicate that it happened while I was minister. I certainly object to it, and I would not allow officers of the department, to my knowledge, to take such action. They must take their choice and speculate outside of the department, or refrain from speculating inside the department. That being the fact, however, there was no warrant for Mr. Ferguson spending the money of this country in securing evidence to this extent for the purpose of proving what every one will admit and bringing a report before Parliament in regard to one man who has not been in the Government service for, I think, over ten years, in regard to another man with whose services our friends on the other side have seen fit to dispense, and in regard to the third man who still is in the Government employ. Either Mr. Ferguson was anxious to put in his time in the preparation of this report—and I think he got $50 for every working day—or he was not able to find anything very serious in the way of delinquency in the Department of the Interior. If he could have found something more serious than the mere fact that these gentlemen bought Indian lands, by tender, taking their chances, getting them if their tender was the highest and not getting them if their tender was not. Mr. Ferguson was not using his time to good advantage when he spent so much of it in order to get this report, and I take it as a certificate of character to the administration of the department, to myself and to my predecessor that Mr. Ferguson, in all his search of two years at $50 a day, with all the authority of the Government behind him, with all the political animus that naturally went with himself and with those that put him into the position, was not able to do better than he did for his employers. Therefore we can take it for granted that under the Liberal Administration the people of Canada had an Administration of their Interior and Indian Affairs that was entirely and highly to their credit and to their benefit.

For a man who is paid $50 a day to find fault, over whom there is no control in any way, shape or form, who can say what he likes, and who by getting individuals into a solitary room and threatening them with process of law, is entitled to take down whatever he can compel them to say and to produce it before Parliament, it is possible to make a very much worse story than he has been able to make, so that if the results have been as they have been under the Liberal Administration, the country is still to be congratulated on the Administration it has received. It is an old saying that the proof of the pudding is in the eating, and we can judge best of Administration by results. As regards the values of land, when the Liberal Administration came into office, the railway companies and the Hudson Bay Company, that had the sale of lands in the Northwest, sold 108,000 acres at an average price of $3.34 per acre. This was all picked land, and they all wanted to sell and most of them employed special selling agents, but the best they could get for 108,000 acres of picked land was only $3.34 an acre. It took some time of Liberal Administration, of administration in the interests of the people of Canada, before the confidence of the people was inspired in the country so that the land advanced in price, because in 1900 the average price was only $3.27; in 1901, $3.36; in 1902, $3.56; in 1903, $3.46; but from 1903, with the inception of the railway policy of the Liberal Administration, the land of the West immediately began to increase in price, and it was $4.39 in 1904; $5.09 in 1905; $6.01 in 1906; $6.02 in 1907; $8.80 in 1908; $11.08 in 1909; $13.36 in 1910 and $13.59 in 1911. In that year the companies sold 1,406,651 acres at $13.59 an acre, the largest sale that had ever been made in any year or that has ever been made since. It is true that in 1914 the average price increased to $14.75, but the quantity of sales decreased to 501,575 acres; that is to say, the price of land increased by a little over a dollar an acre, but the sales decreased by over 900,000 acres. If the Administration of the Interior Department needed the advice that Mr. Ferguson has so kindly given it in all these reports, if it were so lax and slack and if so much fraud were perpetrated, it is not reasonable to suppose that the people would have had confidence in the country so that they would have rushed upon it and taken up homesteads in continually increasing numbers each year under the Liberal Administration, but this is what they did. In 1902, there were 14,673 entries; in 1903, 31,383; in 1904, 26,073; in 1905, 30,819; in 1906, 41,869; for the nine months of 1907 when there was the change in the fiscal year, 21,647; in 1908, 30,424; in 1909, 39,081; in 1910, 41,568, and in 1911, 44,479, or practically 44,500. But as soon as our friends got in and waved the magic wand of "leave well enough alone", entries began to drop, and in 1912 we had 39,000; in 1913, 33,000; 1914, 31,000. And they are still going down.

So I say that while the country must be grateful to Mr. Ferguson for the advice he has given as to the administration of the Interior Department, we think that this advice, if it is worth anything, if it is worth the money this country has paid for it, had better be tendered to our friends on the other side, and they had better take advantage of it, because the country absolutely needs some change in its administration from what it is getting at the present time, as compared with what it got under the late Administration.

As I said in the beginning, here is a report that has cost the country something in the neighbourhood of forty thousand dollars, which must be accepted as absolute evidence that under Liberal Administration our lands in all departments were administered as honestly as they were efficiently, and as the country's record shows they were efficiently administered.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has shown a good deal of heat because the Government has seen fit to appoint Mr. Ferguson as commissioner to inquire into the matters relating to the Interior Department over which the hon. gentleman formerly presided. I do not think he should find so much fault with the Government in investigating certain matters which had more or less a relation to his own administration of the department. I do not think he has very much reason to find fault because of the late time when, as he says, this report has been submitted. The report only came into my possession late in the month of March. It is true, I desired to peruse it before laying it upon the table. The session was in progress, and for the greater part of the time there have been three sittings a day. I had only time to hastily peruse the report and it was submitted to the House at the earliest possible moment under the circumstances. I think he is tolerably familiar with most of the matters discussed here to-day by reason of the fact that he was at the head of the department at the time they occurred, although I agree with him that after a lapse of time one's memory cannot be expected to retain all the details of these various transactions.

The hon. gentleman has stated that very little has been disclosed in return for the thirty-odd thousand dollars that have been paid to Mr. Ferguson. He points to the voluminous report and says that that is about all the country has in return for this large expenditure. It is easily seen that he has not carefully read this report. Because the attention of the country has been directed to the fact that the report has disclosed reasons to believe that the money was well spent. Had he read the report carefully, or even hurriedly, he would have found that it has been proven to the hilt that it has been a good expenditure for these disclosures.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to give us these instances? The matters relate to his own department. Let him come through with some of these instances.

Mr. ROCHE: I will try to give the instances. But, as I say, I have not got all the evidence and it is some time since I read it. The hon. gentleman has done the best he could in defence of himself, and I leave it to the members of this House whether the defence he has put up here in regard to these transactions is one in which the people will take much stock. I think he will find that there are many things that have been admitted on oath by his own former officials that will carry conviction to the people that his administration of the affairs of the Department of the Interior was not in the best interest of the country, and I will quote a few instances as I go along to prove my case. He states that this commission was appointed and this investigation held merely to enable the party press at this late stage of the session to make all the party capital they can against him and the Government of which he was a member. Well, what is the party press supporting himself and his party doing in connection with the investigations going on in the Public Accounts Committee, the Boots Committee and others, if not the very thing that he complains of in this investigation? Read those papers, from The Globe up, and you will find that there is scarcely a Liberal paper from one end of the country to the other that is not distorting the evidence, picking out particular portions from the statements of witnesses that they think will reflect upon this Government, and endeavouring to hold this Government responsible for every little lapse that has taken place in connection with the purchase of horses, boots or any other things the purchase of which has been investigated. Still, the hon. gentleman grumbles and thinks he has a grievance because the Conservative press has been publishing portions of this report which reflects upon himself. He knows what human nature is, and he knows that what-

ever party is in power the press of that party will try to make capital against their opponents and vice versa I think it a rather petty complaint for him to say that this report was brought down late for that purpose.

The hon. gentleman took up first the investigation into certain transactions connected with the Bulletin Company, Limited. He asks what right Mr. Ferguson had to investigate matters pertaining to his private business. There was a time when the hon. gentleman had a serious accusation made against him through the press of the country in connection with a certain deposit or cheque of $69,000. This was just before the late Government went out of power. The hon. gentleman then, both inside and outside this House, challenged the fullest investigation into that transaction, though it had no particular relation to the matters of the department over which he presided. And when he was so courageous to court inquiry into that affair, he should not take exception at Mr. Ferguson's desiring to probe this transaction, particularly in view of the fact that at least a prima facie case was made out for investigation, taking into consideration the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company invested $15,000 in the newspaper publishing company in which the hon. gentleman was interested, while at the same time that company was having direct and continuous relations with the department over which he presided. That is the reason assigned by Mr. Ferguson for this investigation. Let me quote his report on this point:

> With regard to the propriety of the transactions detailed herein, I do not know that it is necessary for me to comment upon the same at any length. The facts speak for themselves. When I learned, as commissioner, that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, having very extensive dealings in the year 1905, in fact, both before and after this stock transaction—was the purchaser of a considerable block of stock from the company practically owned and controlled by the minister presiding over the department with which it was dealing, I felt that it was my duty to examine into the matter, and report accordingly. If I had not felt that it was the duty of the minister to have avoided even the very appearance of all personal business transactions with persons or corporations with whom he was dealing as minister of the Crown, I should not have taken any evidence in this matter.

That is why the investigation was proceeded with. If the hon. member for Edmonton can see no reason why the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company should not have invested money in the paper of which he was proprietor when he presided over the department, then the hon. gentleman has not that sense of propriety that I think he should have. I am confident that if I as Minister of the Interior were unfortunate enough—or fortunate enough, as the case may be—to be the proprietor and publisher of a newspaper; and if, while acting as Minister of the Interior, I induced—because I presume that the hon. member did hold out inducements—the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to take stock in that paper, the hon. gentleman would be the first person to condemn me for so doing.

The hon. gentleman states that nothing was proved as to the connection of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company with the department. Mr. Ferguson did not go into details; he did not set out with the idea of proving any particular point or of delving into the particular transactions in connection with town sites or rights of way, but he did summon as a witness Mr. Lynch of the Railway Lands Branch. From that gentleman's evidence he established the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had relations with the Department of the Interior. The evidence given by Mr. Lynch goes to show that at the time when Mr. Frank Scott purchased the stock in trust on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, paying $15,000 for the same, and when the hon. member for Edmonton was Minister of the Interior, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company were carrying on extensive business transactions with the Department of the Interior, involving the transfer to the company of a large quantity of Government lands, including rights of way, town sites, terminals, etc.

Mr. Ferguson, therefore, established what he set out to establish: that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company were having these relations with the Interior Department; that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company took $15,000 worth of stock in the publishing company of which the then Minister of the Interior was the proprietor. Mr. Scott, who held this stock in trust, swore that he had not invested in it for himself; that the money had been given to him by the then vice-president of the company, and that he could not cite any other instance in which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had invested money in any other newspaper in the Dominion of Canada. It is rather significant that the Edmonton Bulletin, published by the then Minister of the Interior, should be selected above all

other papers by the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the investment of this money. It could not have been because of the large dividends paid by the Edmonton Bulletin Company, because the ex-minister himself says that they have lost their money, and so has he. At any rate, no dividends have been paid. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company paid this $15,000 to Mr. Scott, without any resolution of the company having been passed authorizing the same. It was done secretly; it was done in a manner of which Mr. Scott evidently knew absolutely nothing, except that he was asked to invest this $15,000 in his own name. That is all he could tell about it. He said that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had not invested money in any other papers that he knew of. He said that he has never attended an annual meeting of the directors of the Bulletin Company; that the Grand Trunk Pacific officials never took any particular interest in the affairs of the company. According to the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior, this amount of stock was a gift, because it was not expected that any dividends would be paid upon it. If by this defence which I consider to be a particularly lame one—of the investment of this $15,000 by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in his paper while he was Minister of the Interior, the hon. member for Edmonton means to assert that such a transaction was all right, and should not be questioned by any man either inside or outside of the House, I think that he is taking a stand which will not receive the endorsation of the people of this country.

So far as the company is concerned, Mr. Ferguson states:

> Although I endeavoured to obtain some explanation from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company as to why it did go into this transaction, I have been unable to do so.

No member of the company was in a position to say why this money was invested. I leave it to members of this House to form the conclusion as to why that investment was made, and to judge for themselves as to whether the Grand Trunk Pacific would have invested this $15,000 if the hon. member for Edmonton had been only the private member for Edmonton, and had not been the publisher of the Edmonton Bulletin.

The next point taken up by the hon. gentleman was the matter of the timber lands that were removed from the Riding Mountain forest reserve. It is true that by Act of Parliament certain lands were withdrawn from the Riding Mountain reserve several years ago, and that all squatters who had located on those lands were to be allowed the privilege of taking up homesteads on the lands which had been removed from the reserve. I say frankly that that is not an unusual thing, and we are not complaining about that. What we are complaining about is that hundreds of Liberals who secured entries were not squatters at all, and that the public lands were parcelled out by Mr. Davis, then supervisor of the Riding Mountain forest reserve. This admission on the part of Mr. Davis was conveniently overlooked by the ex-Minister of the Interior in the remarks which he made this afternoon. Mr. Cruise made no pretense of being a squatter, in the legal sense of the term, or, indeed, in any sense of the term. The hon. gentleman says that those who had effected tangible and substantial improvements were allowed to remain on the land. What were the tangible and substantial improvements that Mr. Cruise had to show? He lived near the town of Dauphin, within the nine mile radius. He had a man cut logs for two or three days, and build up four bare log walls. I do not believe they were ever roofed; certainly up to the time the patent was issued this structure, which was to pass as a house, was never roofed. On these tangible and substantial improvements, Mr. Cruise put in his claim as a squatter. Mr. Cruise lived on other lands of his own. He could qualify by stock if he was a legitimate squatter, but we assert that Mr. Cruise was not a legitimate squatter. The supervisor, Mr. Davis, and the land agent, Mr. Herchmer, who received the entries at the town of Dauphin, both say so, and Mr. Ferguson finds that Mr. Cruise was not a squatter. Mr. Cruise had only thirteen head of stock of his own, and, as it was necessary to have twenty in order to prove up, he went to his neighbour—a man by the name of Ward—and, ostensibly, brought seven head of stock over to make up the twenty, giving his promissory note therefor. Mr. Ward kept the stock part of the time on his own property and part of the time during the summer months on Mr. Cruise's. That allowed Mr. Cruise, during the time that Mr. Ward held his note to swear that he was the owner of twenty head of stock; he there-

5 p.m.

fore secured entry for the land. As soon as he got his patent he received back the promissory note and gave back the seven head of cattle to Mr. Ward. And we are asked to be gullible enough to believe that that was a bona fide transaction! This is the manner in which the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Cruise) qualified as a squatter on the Riding Mountain reserve. And Mr. Cruise was not by any means the only one. I will read some rather spicy evidence regarding this. For instance, of all the lands taken out of the Riding Mountain reserve, and there were several hundred quarter-sections given for homestead entry, Mr. Davis, who was the supervisor, swore before Mr. Ferguson that he believed that not more than 40 per cent were occupied by legitimate squatters; and he was the official appointed to do this business by the then Minister of the Interior and was kept in office until after this Government came into power, notwithstanding the protests of his own officials. Now, not only Mr. Davis swore that not more than 40 per cent of the so-called squatters were legitimate, but Mr. Herchmer, the Dominion Lands agent, swore as well that in his opinion not more than 20 per cent were legitimate; and these were the gentlemen who were supposed to have tangible and substantial improvements as squatters and were allowed entries to these lands. I have some evidence to back this up. We have the evidence of Albert McLeod and Sam. Cohen, who were employed by the Government, and who went around with blank orders which were handed to Mr. Davis for his signature, for them to take to the land office; and of course the land agent was compelled to honour them, because he got his instructions from the Minister of the Interior to allow any persons to have entries who bore an order from Mr. Davis.

This is from the evidence of Mr. Davis:

Q. I believe you wrote a large number of orders out in the same way?

That is in blank.

A. Yes, I used to take them with me in blank. It saved a lot of writing.

Q. And after they had been filled in, some were genuine squatters and some were not?—A. Yes; I allowed myself to be used for the party there, to a certain extent, and I am willing to acknowledge it.

Q. Now this Exhibit 1-D, I want to ask you about that, Mr. Davis. In the first place, is that your signature?—A. Yes.

Q. But the rest of it was not written out by you?—A. No.

Q. Who wrote it out?—A. To the best of my knowledge and belief, Albert McLeod.

[Mr. Roche.]

So he was not the only one who wrote out these orders.

Q. And did he issue that, and fill it in himself?—A. Yes.

Q. So that he travelled around with these in blank also?—A. Yes, and he would send them to me with a letter stating that it was right, but I knew better. I will tell you the story.

Q. Yes, tell me the story?—A. I knew that Albert was picking quite a few of the residents in his own locality there, that he wanted to get good quarters for, and make himself strong in that locality; and so he was issuing orders to them on blanks and he would send them to me for signature and I would sign them for him.

Q. Mr. McLeod got out quite a number in that way, I suppose?—A. Yes, I think he did. He made himself quite smooth and nice.

Q. Mr. Herchmer has deposed before me that there must have been hundreds of these orders issued. Did you keep track of the number of orders which you were issuing, which were signed by you, either from your own instigation or that of Albert McLeod or Sam. Cohen?—A. No, sir, I did not.

Q. What was Cohen's idea, can you tell me, in asking you or procuring from you these orders and giving them to the people in this way?—A. Cohen was a rattling good man and a good worker, and he would not let any opportunity slide if he could benefit the party.

This is the way the public lands were parcelled out to the political friends of my hon. friend; and he gets up here to-day and contrasts the management of the land under the Interior Department by this Government with that when he was presiding officer over the department!

Q. I suppose Mr. Davis I could say that would apply to the whole three, all of you at that time?—A. Sure.

This is an illustration of how the lands that were taken out of the reserve were disposed of by the department.

But there is something more. There was dissatisfaction in the department at the head office here. They saw that something was wrong, and it was drawn to the attention of the minister. It was brought to his notice when he was visiting Dauphin, while it was going on, and Mr. Herchmer, the land agent, knew perfectly well what was going on. He wanted some protection for himself, and he brought it to the notice of the then Minister of the Interior. The result of this was that a letter was sent to Mr. Davis from the hon. the then Minister of the Interior, dated September 18, 1907, as follows:

W. A. Davis:

Sir,—I am informed that your work in securing removal of squatters in the Riding and Duck Mountain timber reserves has been completed; that is to say, that you have secured location of all those squatters that you were

able to remove. You will understand that the privilige of locating on the lands formerly included within the Riding and Duck Mountain reserves, set aside by statute, only apply to squatters in the present reserves and that you have no authority to apply for the location of any other persons upon those lands.

Now, this was after the hon. member's attention had been brought to the fact that others than squatters were getting lands, and it having been brought by the land agent to his attention he could not ignore it, and so this letter continues:

The agent is being notified to advertise that those lands hitherto held under reservation will be open in due course to general settlement, first come first served.

That did not put an end to that condition of affairs. Mr. Dixon, in the department, drew the attention of the departmental officials to the unsatisfactory manner in which Davis was performing his work, with the result that this memorandum was submitted to Mr. Dixon by the minister's private secretary:

September 2, 1907.

The minister wants you to wire Mr. Leech to at once go to Riding Mountain and clear up the tangle which Davis finds himself in.

That shows that things were not going smoothly and nicely. He had evidence brought to his attention that things were not going right, and he sent out the celebrated R. E. A. Leech to investigate. Mr. Leech went up there and reported that everything was lovely—and what did he give as evidence? That Davis had told him that it was all right! That is all he reported to the department, that he had consulted Mr. Davis and that Mr. Davis had said that everything was all right. Still, the department were not satisfied, with the result that Mr. Leech was sent back a second time and told to further investigate these lands that were thrown open to squatters. Mr. Leech departed the second time. He came back with a report much the same as before; he could find nothing wrong. Mr. Davis was his authority, the very gentleman who himself swears that everything was wrong, that he was giving these lands to help his party friends, and so were McLeod and Cohen. So I do not think that there is anything that reflects very great credit upon the administration of the department in connection with those particular lands taken out of the Riding Mountain reserve.

The next matter the hon. member took up was the transaction of the Southern Alberta Land Company; and he thought he was making a point against this Government and was practically receiving endorsation for that transaction by reason of the fact that we had introduced in the last session of Parliament an estimate for a refund to the Southern Alberta Land Company of $380,000 which they had paid in advance for their land, a portion of which was expended during this past year, the balance being a revote this year. But that is no endorsation of the original arrangement entered into by the Government. Not at all. How did we find this arrangement. It was presented to us by the late Mr. Newton, who represented that company in Canada. This was the famous Robbins Irrigation Co. deal. J. D. McGregor and his friends sold them on the English market at an immense profit, they passed again into the possession of another company at another immense profit and eventually they fell into the hands of the Southern Alberta Land Company, a large quantity of stock being sold. This stock was widely distributed throughout the Old Country by the Grenfell Company which practically had the management of it. The Grenfell Company went into liquidation last year. Then the Southern Alberta Land Company was hard pressed. Their irrigation works were about completed to the extent that they could turn the water on the land and put the land in a position to sell for irrigation purposes. They came to the Government and said that if they did not receive some assistance in a financial way the scheme and the country would get a black eye and all the money that had been invested would be lost. What were we to do? Were we to allow the country to get a black eye? This scheme had received the endorsement of the late Government and if we refused to comply with their request so that they could utilize their works and turn the water on the land it would have been most damaging to the good name of the country and the investment would have been placed in jeopardy. The company merely asked us to loan the money that they had paid in for the land. They gave the Government a lien on their land and works as security. They had spent in the neighbourhood of $6,000,000 altogether. Surely we have security which is ample to protect us for refunding back to them the money which they had paid in for the land at the rate of $1 an acre, or in all $380,000. That is no endorsation of the scheme and we are not open to censure by reason of refunding this $380,000 to enable

the company to put its works into operation and allow the land to be occupied under irrigation conditions. It is practically a loan because we took a lien on the land and works. We are charging them the same rate of interest—5 per cent—that we have been charging on irrigation schemes and other transactions of a similar nature.

There is another irrigation deal in connection with this report and it is the Aylwin deal. There was a gentleman by the name of Aylwin who had taken up with the late Minister of the Interior the idea of buying 350,000 acres of land. Negotiations had proceeded to a certain extent but in time he found that he could not have access to the minister, he said that he only saw him on one or two occasions and he came to the conclusion that he would have to have other influence. He had not sufficient backing to get access to the then minister and he went to Mr. Robert, of Montreal, the president of the Tramways Company, who, it was claimed, stood well in the favour of the Prime Minister and another member of the Government. Mr. Robert came up and had several interviews with the then Prime Minister in regard to this matter. The letters which are on file go to show that the then Prime Minister assured him that if anybody got this land he and his associates would, Mr. Robert had no financial interest in the land originally but he was using his influence because his brother was in the deal. Robert visited Ottawa on several occasions and saw several members of the Government about the matter, particularly the then Prime Minister, and received every encouragement to believe that he would get the land eventually. I should say that Mr. Robert got 18 cents an acre as his commission for using his influence, which amounted altogether to $12,000. He bought out the interest of Mr. Newton, of Winnipeg, who had an interest in the deal, and when the lands were sold Mr. Robert got over $18,000 as his share by reason of his acquisition of the Newton interest. Mr. Robert was very well paid for his influence in connection with this deal. But Mr. Robert did not have entirely plain sailing. There was a gentleman by the name of Denton in the city of Toronto and he and some of his friends also desired to get some of these lands. In order to put up a bluff that he had certain influence that could carry him through with the members of the Government, he went to Robert in Montreal and the bluff worked so well that Denton was handed over many thousands of dollars, although he had never invested a cent.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is Denton?

Mr. ROCHE: He is a Frank Denton, barrister, of Toronto. He came here representing himself and his friends and he bluffed Robert into an arrangement by which he got a good slice of this property. I should say in connection with Mr. Aylwin that he had to take 69,000 instead of the 350,000 acres for which he had applied. I draw the attention of the House to this most significant feature, that these 69,000 acres, which adjoined the lands of the Southern Alberta Land Company, were sold by the Government notwithstanding that they knew at the time that they were not irrigable. The officers of the department had reported that the lands were not irrigable and that there was no means of providing for their irrigation in view of the fact that other lands had been disposed of to the Southern Alberta Land Company. The Southern Alberta Land Company had practically monopolized all the ditches and water rights and this Aylwin company were absolutely debarred from irrigating their land and were absolutely dependent upon the Southern Alberta Land Company for irrigation. On this 69,000 acres, for which $3 an acre was paid, they have allowed a refund of $2 an acre. The works of the company had never been gone on with. They had eventually to enter into an arrangement with the Southern Alberta Land Company in order to get their land irrigated at all. What I condemn the department under the late Government for is that having disposed of land to the Southern Alberta Land Company they should have gone to their other friends and sold them 69,000 acres of land that were not irrigable at all.

The hon. gentleman has also brought up the question of the Craven dam. He says there is nothing in that, and claims that it was simply investigated for the purpose of bringing in the names of Mr. Scott and Mr. Brown. The hon. gentleman says that it is all right for the Government to sell land at $1 an acre and for the purchasers three years after patent issued to sell it to the Government for $25 an acre. A strange thing about it is that, when the Government were seeking to expropriate the land and when the judge allowed $25 an acre for it, Mr. Brown, now the Lieut. Governor of Saskatchewan, actually came forward and swore that the land was worth $100

an acre. What a wonderful transformation in the price of land in a few years!

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister be good enough to verify the date? I think the period must be longer than three years.

Mr. ROCHE: It is in the neighbourhood of three years after patent issued.

Mr. OLIVER: I have no doubt that the minister has the papers and if he refers to them he will find that he is pretty far wrong.

Mr. ROCHE: I do not think I am wrong.

Mr. OLIVER: I am sure he is.

Mr. ROCHE: At any rate, it does not make a great deal of difference, when lands which were only $1 an acre suddenly jump to $25 an acre when the Government want to expropriate them, and when Mr. Brown swears that they are worth $100 an acre, whether it is three years or five years. I think Mr. Ferguson says in his report that when Mr. Brown was buying these lands he decried them and said they were practically worthless—that they were only swamp lands and could only be useful for hay; and the fact is that two or three years after the issue of the patent to Mr. Brown, he swore the lands were worth $100 an acre. It was decided to expropriate the lands, and $25 an acre was allowed for them. In these proceedings, forgetful of the fact that a few years previously he had said they were practically valueless and that he purchased them for a dollar an acre, Mr. Brown swore that the value of the land was $100 an acre and that they would produce on an average two tons of hay per acre per annum. You can figure that out for yourself. I do not know what the price of hay was, but I think it was probably $10 a ton, but take it even at $5 a ton and you have 1,000 acres producing 2,000 tons at $5 a ton or $10,000 per annum.

Mr. NESBITT: Would the minister value lands at $100 an acre that would only produce two tons of hay to the acre?

Mr. ROCHE: I am not putting any value on the lands. I am giving you the sworn statement of the owner of the lands as to what he valued them at.

Mr. NESBITT: He was trying to sell them then?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, and when he was trying to buy them he said the lands were worth only a dollar an acre.

Mr. NESBITT: There are lots of fellows like him; the woods are full of them. Does the minister think that land that only grew two tons of hay to the acre was worth $100 an acre? If he does, he does not know anything about land values.

Mr. ROCHE: I am not saying that I do know anything about land values; I never saw the land, and I do not know what the value of the land was to my personal knowledge, but I am giving you the evidence of this gentleman that he purchased the lands at a dollar an acre, and two or three years after he got his patent he swore that they were worth $100 an acre.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister has mentioned the date that Brown got his patent; can he state when Brown made an agreement to purchase from the Government?

Mr. ROCHE: I think it was 1906.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the minister any estimate by the department as to the present value of these lands?

Mr. ROCHE: I am glad the hon. member mentioned that, and I wish to tell him that we are not sending out inspectors to value lands that have passed out of the possession of the Government; but I do charge against the minister of the day dereliction of duty in not sending inspectors around to value these lands before they were sold. When any lands are sold to-day, I can assure my hon. friend that we send out our inspectors to inspect them and to report as to their value. No such thing was done in connection with the sale of these lands; no inspection was made of them; no report as to their value was had, and the price put upon them by Mr. Brown was acceded to and recommended by the then commissioner, Mr. Turriff, who now sits in this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think these lands were expropriated in 1910.

Mr. ROCHE: I am not sure, but the evidence is there, and my hon. friend can see.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would like to know that; I think I was Minister of Public Works when they were expropriated. I do know that in 1900 lands representing thousands of acres in that vicinity were sold at a dollar an acre.

Mr. ROCHE: I think a good many acres were sold at the time for a dollar an acre, but I believe—

Mr. PUGSLEY: And sold by companies.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No.

Mr. ROCHE: I may say that these lands were sold to Mr. Brown on the recommendation of Mr. Walter Scott. Mr. Brown in effect said that he did not come alone and that he did not depend on his own influence to get these lands, but he admits he secured the services of Mr Walter Scott, and he secured these services because of Mr. Scott's political influence. It was at the request of Mr. Walter Scott that these lands were reserved for a year before they were sold.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to be perfectly clear as to what the minister states. I think he made the observation that the sale of these lands took place to Lieutenant-Governor Brown during my administration of the Interior Department. I want him to be satisfied on that point before he makes the statement, because I am quite clear that it is not so.

Mr. ROCHE: I have not the exact date before me, and it may have been that it was under the administration of the hon. gentleman's predecessor that the lands were originally sold, and if I am to diagnose by his interruption that the hon. gentleman condemns the whole thing, then I am glad of the interruption, and I will exonerate him from being the gentleman who sold these lands.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to point out that the period of time between the sale to Brown and the sale by Brown was the difference between the years 1900 and 1910, and that lands in the Northwest appreciated in value in that time, three, four, and six times.

Mr. ROCHE: Does the hon. gentleman say that these lands were worth $100 an acre?

Mr. OLIVER: I would not think so; they would not be worth that to me.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister be good enough to furnish the House with the date at which the agreement to purchase was made by Brown?

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. gentleman can read the evidence for himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is important, and I will tell the hon. gentleman why it is important.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. ROCHE: I have not the report before me, but it is on the table of the House and the hon. gentleman can look that up for himself.

Mr. OLIVER: The Minister of the Interior has insisted on referring to me as having been a party to this transaction, and he fixes the date at a period that would justify the remarks he has made, when as a matter of fact the date was different and would not justify his remarks.

Mr. ROCHE: It is stated they were sold in 1910.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know when the lands were sold, because I have not the papers before me. My impression is that they were sold approximately ten years between the purchase of Brown and the sale by Brown, and during that ten years the general price of land in the West appreciated five, six, seven, eight, ten times.

Mr. ROCHE: That might apply to lands adjacent to large cities like Edmonton or Calgary, but I know, as a matter of fact, that these lands did not appreciate in value to any such extent.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I know they did.

Mr. ROCHE: At all events, it was represented in the first place that they were only swamp lands covered with water, and Lieut. Governor Brown states they were not worth more than a dollar an acre, but strange to say these gentlemen opposite who are so anxious to make out that this report is an attempt to make political capital against the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan, forget that it was he who swore that these lands were worth $100 an acre. I leave the evidence before the country and the House to be judged on its merits. I should say that of these lands there were about 1,000 acres, and 518 acres were purchased at one dollar an acre, and the balance represented half-breed scrip. It was, as I say, about three years after he got the patent that they were expropriated at a price of $25 per acre, so that this gentleman made very well out of his deal with the late Government, which professed so much solicitude with regard to the manner in which the public domain should be dealt with.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) has also spoken about the grazing lease to Mr. H. B. Brown. This matter has been threshed out in the House before, and I am not

going to enter exhaustively in to a discussion of it now. I may say that Mr. H. B. Brown was a mere stool-pigeon for Mr. J. D. McGregor. H. B. Brown lived in Montana and the application was made in his name. He knew nothing about it. Notice after notice, week after week, month after month, were sent to Mr. Brown and never replied to by him. Mr. McGregor and Mr. A. J. Adamson were the power behind the throne, and Mr. Adamson, ex-M.P., is the gentleman who eventually took over this grazing proposition, and H. B. Brown was merely utilized by these gentlemen. There is one point in connection with this deal that looks rather suspicious, and it is this: Although 28,000 acres of land was what was applied for, in some manner a recommendation was placed on file increasing the amount to 60,000 acres, and that was done by the present member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) when he was commissioner.

When the hon. member was examined by Mr. Ferguson and asked for an explanation, he failed to give one, and said that he could not give one. No request came from Mr. Brown; he did not know anything about the matter; no request came from Mr. McGregor, so Mr. McGregor stated; and still in some mysterious manner the area was increased from 28,000 to 60,000 acres. This was done without any request except as conveyed by word of mouth and secretly, as there is nothing in the files to show that a request was made. In connection with the rental of this land, Mr. Brown owed arrears of some $2,400, and these were wiped off. Mr. Adamson should have paid them, but he did not do so; he was forgiven, and the lease was made a closed irrevocable one, although originally it was a 21-year lease and it could be cancelled by two years' notice being given.

The next point dwelt upon by the hon. gentleman is that of the Kananaskis Coal Company. My hon. friend agrees that employees of the Government should not act as purchasers or middlemen when dealing with the Government in connection with concessions for coal or land irrigation propositions, or anything of that kind, and in that I quite agree with him; but he has stated that the services of all these men in connection with this deal have been dispensed with. Who has dispensed with their services? Mr. Howard Douglas was superintendent of the Rocky Mountain park, and he engineered practically the whole deal. There was a certain timber berth within the Rocky Mountain forest reserve which it was desired to exchange; and in order to get it exchanged, Mr. Douglas associated with himself two of his own sons, an employee of the Government, another gentleman I think from Medicine Hat, and others. They sent in an application to have the timber area within the reserve exchanged for another area without the reserve. Mr. Douglas was the gentleman to whom they referred the matter for recommendation, and he recommended it, saying it would be an excellent proposition. Why would he not do so? His own two sons and his son-in-law were in the deal, and therefore he recommended it and the exchange was made. Not long afterwards, these gentlemen found out that a certain area of the timber limit was not very remunerative, having very little timber on it. Therefore they applied to have this portion exchanged for another area, but for a time the minister stood out firmly and replied: "The man in whose name the application is cannot come back again; he must not come back again; he has made one exchange, and he cannot make another." In the meantime, however, Mr. R. G. A. Leech, who by the way was interested in the same proposition, visited Ottawa and saw the officers of the department, and, strange to say, the minister's fortitude gave way, and while at first he said: "This gentleman must not come back again," he succumbed and allowed the exchange to be made, and these gentlemen got practically a new limit, one that the Government had valued a year or so before at $162,000.

Mr. HENDERSON: Nothing wrong.

Mr. ROCHE: I should also say that the old timber berth was worth about $12,000. It was Government officials who were seeking these concessions and who obtained the exchange, and still Mr. Howard Douglas was retained in his office until this Government came into power; he was dismissed by this Government; and then questions were placed on the Order Paper as to why this man was dismissed. The evidence goes to show that this gentleman got a Mr. Garrett, an official of the department, to send in an application in connection with this berth, and Mr. Garrett stated that he did not know what he was doing; that he signed what his superior officer asked him to, because he was a subordinate of Mr. Howard Douglas.

The hon. member has discussed the question of the Blood reserve very briefly, and so will I. The grazing privileges were given

to a Mr. McEwan of Brandon, but who in reality was Mr. Peter Ryan of Toronto, and these grazing privileges were given without tender and after a great deal of dissatisfaction on the part of Mr. Millar of Toronto, who had applied for these grazing privileges and had been led to believe that his application was regular and in order and that he would receive the same; but in the absence of the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Sifton, Mr. Pedley, who was then Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, acted. Mr. Charles Millar was ignored, although he had been led to believe that be would get the concession, and the concession was handed over to the McEwan-Ryan outfit. Mr. Millar, when giving evidence before Mr. Commissioner Ferguson, swore that when Mr. Sifton was informed of this, he told him that he had been buncoed out of the grazing privileges. Now, who buncoed him out? The officers of the Department of Indian Affairs, evidently. Mr. Ryan, in his evidence, admits that he executed a deed of trust in favour of Mr. Bedford Jones, who held in trust for Mr. Pedley 6 per cent interest in this lease, and this 6 per cent interest was afterwards sold to Mr. Millar for $1,000, which Mr. Bedford Jones swore was handed over, less $100, to the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. This, in short, is the history of the Blood reserve lease.

There were other Indian lands that were dealt with by certain officials of the Government, in regard to which blank tenders were given; or at least tenders were sent to the city of Toronto and were filled in there with the names of fictitious individuals. These leases were sent into the department, and the then Deputy Superintendent General, Mr. Smart, passed upon them. Although as Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, he was the guardian of Indian lands, and was selling for the Government, he became a purchaser himself in company with the other two gentlemen. The profit on the Moose mountain reserve was something over $45,000. It was bought on the 9th of November, 1901, and sold in April, 1902, for the sum of $112,500, through one of the immigration officers in the United States, a Mr. Charles Pilling, a former Brandon man. On the next reserve the profits were $8,000, and on the next over $18,000. Taking the three reserves, these gentlemen cleared something over $84,000. The whole thing was done in secret and under cover of three partners, as was brought out in the evidence. If the hon. gentleman thinks that is all right we have a different idea of the propriety of things, and I am quite willing to allow the people of this country to judge as to these transactions.

If this Government designed to prosecute the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior, if we desired to ask Mr. Ferguson to delve deeper into my hon. friend's affairs, or into his private transactions as a private individual, or as Minister of the Interior, we had plenty of evidence without going to Mr. Ferguson at all. All we had to do was to peruse some of the files in the Department of the Interior. The hon. gentleman knows that away back in 1890 he took up a homestead within a couple of miles of the city of Edmonton. At that time the person living within the two-mile limit did not require to reside upon the land; But he resided a portion of the time within the two-mile limit and then removed his residence beyond it. It is true, he performed his cultivation duties eventually. At first, he was not performing his duties and asked for an extension of time in order to protect his land. That extension, one of the officers replied to him, could be granted to him for, say, one year, or as an alternative he would be allowed the privilege of cancelling his entry and purchasing the land at the regulation price of $3 an acre. The time went on and the hon. gentleman did not avail himself of the alternative proposition. After a time he wrote a letter to the department stating that it was not convenient for him to perform the rest of his duties, and applying for the privilege of purchasing the land, in lieu of the residential duties and the erection of the house which he should have put upon the land, and I think a residence of about three months was required notwithstanding his being within the two-mile limit. He requested the right of purchase, and named his own price, $1 an acre. This was recommended by his particular friend in the department. The sale was recommended while the late Government was in power, and recommended by the then Commissioner of Lands, Mr. Turriff, who stated that he thought it very inconvenient for the ex-minister to perform his duties and that he should be allowed the privilege of buying the land at $1 an acre. The lands were sold to him. When he made his homestead entry there was printed on the homestead entry a statement that the mines and minerals were to be reserved in accordance with the Order in Council that was passed on the 31st October, 1887. I have the original applica-

tion here, and this is stamped across the face. So the hon. gentleman could not be under any misapprehension that he was the owner of the minerals. In the patent there was again the clause reserving the mines and minerals. The hon. gentleman could hardly have forgotten it, because this declaration of reservation was in both these documents. Nevertheless, in the year 1906, on the 8th of October, he leased the mines and minerals to a gentleman by the name of Wills, who was to pay a royalty of 10 cents a ton on all the coal that was mined, which was the royalty exacted by the Government at that time. Mr. Wills worked the property and paid royalty, how much I am not sure, but a very substantial sum, to the ex-Minister of the Interior. And this was for the lease of mining rights which had been reserved and did not belong to the hon. gentleman at all. He simply could not have been under the impression that he owned these mines and minerals, and I will tell you why. I have stated that it was on the 8th of October, 1906, that he gave the lease. On the 26th of February, 1907, about five months thereafter, I find here on the file a letter from the Chief Clerk of the Patents Branch, Mr. N. O. Coté. Apparently, the minister of that time had been asking as to reservations of mines and minerals in the leases, and this is the answer:

With reference to your verbal request I beg to inform you that the under rights were not reserved in the patents which issued for the following lands:

N.E. ¼ 32-52-23 west 4th meridian, patented 21st July, 1886, to Alex McDougall.

N.W. ¼ 32-52-23, west 4th meridian, patented 6th April, 1888, to Francis Oliver.

S. ½ of S.E. ¼ 32-52-23 west 4th meridian, and legal subdivisions 12, 13 and 14 of 28, 52-23 west 4th meridian, patented 10th August, 1886, to Geo. Whitford.

I find, however, that the patents which isued in your name for lots 31 and 33,—

He purchased lot 33, consisting of 174 acres, at the rate of $2 an acre, lot 31 being a homestead.

—Edmonton settlement, reserved to the Crown the mines and minerals, as you did not appear to have had any claim to the said land prior to the 31st October, 1887, from which date all patents for lands west of the 3rd meridian reserved the mines and minerals to the Crown. It is also observed that in the application which you made before the agent of Dominion lands in 1890 for homestead entry for the part of said lot 31 such entry was granted subject to the provisions of the Order in Council of the 31st October, 1887, reserving all mines and minerals.

So that for the third time, and in answer to his own verbal request, he had the fact drawn to his attention that mines and minerals were reserved. This was five months after he had leased to Mr. Wills. Did he recall the lease? Did he cease accepting royalties? Did he pay back the royalties he had collected up to that time? Nothing of the kind. He continued the lease up to the time when this Government came into power, and he collected substantial sums by way of royalties from Mr. Wills up to that time on minerals that were owned by the Crown, and the Crown has never got a dollar out of it. I have some receipts here which the hon. gentleman gave Mr. Wills for the royalties. Within a month or thereabouts after this Government came into power evidently he had some compunction of conscience in regard to it; perhaps he supposed there was going to be an exposure, a new party being in power, and probably some commission would be issued. He applied to the department for a lease of the mines and minerals on the 2nd November, 1911. But he had made the lease with Mr. Wills on the 8th of October, 1906, for ten years. He got a lease for twenty-one years, renewable, the royalty being changed from 10 cents a ton to 5 cents a ton. He, to protect himself, having the right to issue a sub-lease, in November, 1911, issued a sub-lease to Mr. Wills to run for five years from December, 1911. During all that time he has been collecting royalties, and during that time he has been paying the rental of $1 an acre to the department. He has not paid any royalty as yet. I am not saying that is his fault; if there is a fault, it lies with the department. And, as a matter of fact, we frequently give extensions of time. I am not finding fault with that; as a matter of fact, an extension of time was granted. But one condition of his lease was that he was to make quarterly returns of all coal mined and to pay a royalty of five cents a ton. From the date of his lease, December, 1911, he has not made any returns—at least, I cannot find any statement on the files—showing any coal mined at all, while he admits that the claim is being worked. How, under these circumstances, he could give a lease to another party, accept royalties of thousands of dollars from that party and pay nothing to the Government, passes my comprehension. If the hon. gentleman had desired to be fair, after he got his lease from the Govern-

ment he would at least have paid over the royalties collected from Mr. Wills during the time that he had no lease. Hon. gentlemen talk about restitution; about investigations in the Public Accounts Committee; about money having been refunded by a clerk in the city of Ottawa; and so on. They clamour for restitution on the part of those who received undue profits; what about restitution in this case?

Mr. OLIVER: If Mr. Wills says that he paid me $2,000, or $1,000, in the way of royalties before 1911; he states what is absolutely untrue.

Mr. ROCHE: He certainly states it.

Mr. OLIVER: Then he makes a statement that has no semblance of truth in it.

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. gentleman admits that he got royalties.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, I admit that Mr. Wills paid some royalties.

Mr. ROCHE: It is simply a question of the amount.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. ROCHE: I cannot vouch for the accuracy of Mr. Wills' statement as to the amount, but I am glad that the hon. gentleman admits the accuracy of my statement that he accepted royalties when he had no authority to do so, in respect of mines and minerals that he did not own, and of which he had no lease. These royalties have not been paid over to the Government. This emphasizes the point that while a minister of the Crown, and supposed to be the guardian of the Treasury so far as the Department of the Interior was concerned, the hon. gentleman collected royalties in respect of which not one dollar has since been paid over to the Government.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROCHE (resuming): Mr. Speaker, prior to recess I had just about completed my reference to the matter immediately under discussion, namely, the particular homestead lands that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) had secured and paid for and for which he did not have the mineral rights. Some criticism has been offered and some questions asked by some hon. members as to how the hon. member came to receive a lease of these mineral rights after the present Government came into power. Of course, under our regulations, any person who complies with the regulations is entitled to have a lease of mineral rights; but priority is always given to the party who is the owner of the surface rights. So the matter was dealt with departmentally, it did not come before the then Minister of the Interior at all, was passed upon by the officers of the department; as it was considered that there was no reason why that lease should be refused, the rental having been tendered for the first year at the rate of $1 an acre and the other regulations having been complied with. Of course, there was nothing on the file to show that the mines and minerals had been leased by the hon. member for Edmonton to Mr. Wills prior to the securing of his lease from the Crown. This is the explanation of how the lease came to be issued in November of 1911, after the present Government came into power. In the lease to Mr. Wills, that is the first lease in 1906, it was provided that he should pay a royalty of 10 cents a ton, which in the second lease was changed to 5 cents, and that he should mine at least 500 tons per annum. The mine was operated and certain royalties were paid. I have a few of the receipts given by the then Minister of the Interior in the form of letters. One is dated the 2nd of January, 1908:

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 23rd to hand regarding Buffalo park fence; also cheque, royalty on coal, for which thanks. Wishing you the compliments of the season,

Yours very truly,

Frank Oliver.

Mr. Robert Wills,
Edmonton, Alberta.

It does not say there what amount of royalty was received. There is another dated February 13. No doubt it was for one month, as the next letter is dated February 13, 1908, as follows:

I have your letter of the 4th instant containing cheque for $71.40, which is quite satisfactory, although the bigger it is the better.

Yours faithfully,

Frank Oliver.

Mr. Robert Wills.

I have another here of March 12, 1908, which says:

Yours of March 2 to hand, with cheque for $54.14 royalty on coal for January. I thank you very much and wish you all success. I have no objection to another shaft being put down in the uncultivated part and so long as fencing is provided so that the grain on the cultivated portion will not be interfered with. I have not thought of selling the farm and would not care to do so unless or until I visited Edmonton.

There is another on the 10th of April, 1908:

> Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 31st ultimo enclosing $48.35 royalty on 483½ tons of coal for the month of February.
>
> Yours faithfully,
> Frank Oliver.

These receipts are all for the same year, showing that royalties had been collected for several months in that year; and other royalties were, of course, collected, the receipts for which I have not here at present. The lease to Wills provided that at least 500 tons should be mined each year. I notice here in one month that 483½ tons of coal was mined in February. So while the hon. gentleman may take issue with the statement made by Mr. Wills that he had paid a couple of thousand dollars, or in that neighbourhood, of royalties, still I have word from Mr. Wills to the effect that from November, 1907, up to December, 1912, some 18,360 tons were mined, and this does not include the royalty since December, 1912. Mr. Wills' recollection of the amount of coal which he mined and the royalty which he paid differs materially from that of the ex-Minister of the Interior if he says that he has not received as much as $1,000 in the way of royalty. But 10 cents a ton on 19,000 tons would be in the neighbourhood of $1,900, so it is pretty close to $2,000 which Mr. Wills claimed he had paid the ex-Minister of the Interior, and I have read you the receipts which the hon. member gave to Mr. Wills for a portion of the year 1908, showing that he had accepted royalties from mines and minerals which he had no authority whatever to lease to Mr. Wills. He practically admits that he takes no issue with that statement; and for my part I certainly would not make it if the records did not bear me out. The hon. gentleman, will, I think, upon reflection come to the conclusion, having this brought forcibly to his mind to-day in the course of this debate, that he has been so derelict in his duty in safeguarding the treasury of the Department of the Interior and the interests of the people of Canada in the administration of the lands under his management at that time, that he should, at the first possible opportunity, avail himself of the privilege of sending in a cheque to pay for those royalties that he received during the years from 1906 to 1912, collected from Mr. Wills when he had not leased the mines and minerals himself and when he was not the owner of the same. So much for the matter of that homestead and the mines and minerals on it.

There is another matter to which I would like to refer very shortly, which also is on the files of the department. That is in connection with the sale, when the hon. gentleman was minister, of certain Indian lands. Certain Indian lands were sold to a gentleman named Fahrni, who purchased in the neighbourhood of 23 sections. The purchase price was in the neighbourhood of $25,000. It was to be paid in five equal annual instalments. He met his first payment of, in round numbers, $5,000. Mr. Fahrni then fell upon evil days financially and was unable to keep up his subsequent payments. He asked from time to time for an extension of time and he was granted certain extensions. He called on his friend Mr. Crawford, who was at the time the member for the constituency of Portage la Prairie, to intercede in his behalf with the department in order that he might have an extension of time to pay his arrearages. Mr. Crawford did intercede with the department and replied to him favourably, that he was to receive an extension of time for payment. Subsequently, however, he was still more in arrears, and he was being pressed from the department for payment of substantial sums of these arrearages. In the year 1909-10 he was written to and threatened with cancellation if he did not make a substantial payment. He then wired to the department asking for 30 days' extension of time. He said that he hoped in the meantime to be able to effect a sale. The department granted him the extension of time on the understanding that he would make a substantial payment in the neighbourhood of $2,000 down. Unfortunately for himself, he was unable to make the payment even at the expiration of the 30 days. On April 27, 1910, when he thought he was going to lose what money he had put in—because the department had told him that if they cancelled the lease he would forfeit his payment of $5,000 which in accordance with the regulations would not be refunded to him—he replied suggesting a method of settling the differences between himself and the department. He was alarmed as he could not afford the loss of $5,000. He had passed through the financial stringency of the year 1908 and was unable to make the payment, and suggested, by way of relief to himself and in order that the department would not lose anything, that the department should retain the $5,000 which he had paid on the 23 sections and

apply it as payment on two quarter-sections which he had sold out of the 23, so that patent might issue for the two quarter-sections.

He stated in his letter that "there are several precedents for it, and I can produce some of very recent date." The request was refused by the department; they would not allow that. They got very strict with him, and they wrote to him and told him that they would have to cancel his claim. On the 2nd of June, 1910, they wrote a letter to Mr. Fahrni telling him that his purchase of these lands had been cancelled. Prior to this, on May 10, I may say that the sale had been cancelled. I have a memorandum of the department signed by the then deputy superintendent general of Indian Affairs, Mr. Pedley, to the following effect:

Whereas the undermentioned lands in the Michel Indian reserve, standing in the name of Christopher Fahrni, were sold to him subject to the payment of equal annual instalments.

And whereas it has been represented and established to my satisfaction that the condition under which these lands were sold has been violated.

Now therefore by and in virtue of the powers and duties vested in the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs by the Indian Act, chapter 81, section 61, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, I hereby cancel the said sales and resume the said lands.

Frank Pedley.

They did that, and, of course, it meant that the $5,000 was forfeited. This was followed by a notification on the 2nd of June of the cancellation that had taken place on the 10th of May. On the 2nd of June Mr. Fahrni was communicated with as follows:

Ottawa, 2nd June, 1910.

Sir,—I beg to inform you that the sales of the lands purchased by you in the Michel Indian reserve, on the 5th December, 1906, have been cancelled, the moneys paid thereon forfeited, and the lands resumed by the department in order that they may be disposed of to other purchasers.

There was the notification that cancellation had taken place, that the money had been forfeited, and that the lands were to be placed at the disposal of another eligible applicant. It was on the 2nd of June that he was notified, and on the 3rd of June a letter was sent from Edmonton to the department as follows:

Edmonton, June 3, 1910,

Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Could you oblige me by obtaining for me the addresses of Mr. F. W. Grant and Mr. Christopher Fahrni, who each hold considerable land purchased in the Michel Indian reserve some years ago and in this district.

Thanking you in anticipation.

Yours very truly,

J. J. Anderson.

I understand that Mr. Anderson is the manager of the Union bank in the city of Edmonton, and I understand also that he has the honour of being the son-in-law of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). That application was dated on the 3rd of June, Mr. Fahrni having been notified on the 2nd of June that cancellation had taken place and that the money had been forfeited. Four days after Mr. Anderson had sent his letter from Edmonton, strange to say, a change came over the spirit of the dreams of those in charge of this affair, and another letter was despatched to Mr. Fahrni, dated 7th of June, which read as follows:

Referring to letter addressed you on the 2nd instant, notifying of cancellation of sales of lands purchased by you in the Michel reserve, I beg to say, that upon further consideration it has been decided to allow this matter to stand for the present, and no further action will be taken towards carrying out cancellation.

Why this change of mind at this particular time? Mr. Fahrni had not asked for it. He thought it was all up with him. He had made the modest request that he should be allowed, in order not to forfeit his $5,000, that it should be applied on two quarter-sections out of the 23 sections, but that was not allowed. He was notified of the absolute cancellation which had taken place on May 10, and he had never written any letter to the department as far as I can discover, asking to be reinstated. Notwithstanding that, after the letter was sent to the department by Mr. Anderson, Mr. Fahrni was reinstated and the cancellation proceedings were not gone on with. Why was that done? For several months thereafter there is nothing to show that Mr. Fahrni was requested to make further payments. The department put Mr. Anderson in touch with Mr. Fahrni, and Mr. Anderson, in fact, got in touch with Mr. Fahrni, and he took over the lands from Mr. Fahrni, allowing him the amount of the first payment which he had made less a quarter-section, or $4,900. He took over the purchase that Fahrni had made, paying to Fahrni just his first payment in order to save the money that he had put in, and Mr. Anderson became the purchaser of these lands. These lands were

purchased for in the neighbourhood of $25,000.

There is nothing in the regulations that goes to show that there can be any reinstatement of cancelled lands. I have the regulations here and they do not provide for reinstating any cancelled lands. I have taken the trouble to make some inquiry, and I find that where lands had once been cancelled by reason of the non-fulfilment of the conditions, such as the non-payment of instalments, no precedent can be found for the reinstatement of these lands even where the purchaser would profess to be able to pay immediately for the same. Mr. Fahrni did not ask for reinstatement; he did not profess to be able to pay; and still, without his request, and after Mr. Anderson had sent in his application to get in touch with Mr. Fahrni, they were reinstated. The provision with respect to forfeiture, section 5 of the Indian Land Regulations, is as follows:

> Any violation of the conditions of sale will render the land in respect to which the same has taken place, as well as all moneys paid on account thereof, forfeitable by order of the Superintendant General of Indians Affairs.

There is nothing in the regulations to provide for reinstatement; notwithstanding that, reinstatement did take place. In the meantime, Mr. Anderson becomes the purchaser of the land that Fahrni had purchased for $25,000. This sale ran along for some time, and it transpired that last year there was another transfer of this land from Mr. Anderson. I have a copy of the transfer, or of the abstract, which shows that these lands were transferred, and the date of the registry of the title was the 2nd of November, 1914. The grantor was John J. Anderson, manager of the Union Bank in Edmonton, and son-in-law of the ex-Minister of the Interior, and he transferred these lands to Mr. Frank Oliver. There is no consideration put in here whatever. Under the heading, "Quantity of land and consideration" are written the words, "transferring above land." It would appear by this form that these lands were transferred without any consideration whatever from Mr. Anderson to Mr. Frank Oliver. That was on the 2nd day of November, which is the date of the registry of the title. On the 4th day of November Mr. Frank Oliver registered a mortgage to the Saskatchewan Savings Society, Limited, to the amount of $25,000 on this land, which was the total amount that Mr. Fahrni had originally bought the land for. Therefore, according to this, the present owner, Mr. Frank Oliver, had mortgaged the land to the Saskatchewan Savings Society, Limited, and I am given to understand that the personnel of the Saskatchewan Savings Society consists of the Hon. Arthur Sifton, Mrs. Sifton and Miss Sifton. And so $25,000 was advanced, if I am correctly informed; at any rate, the abstract is absolutely correct, and the significant part of this is that I have here, while that transaction was taking place from Mr. Anderson to Mr. Oliver, a sworn declaration by Mr. Anderson, as to the value at that time, October, 1914, of these lands, and what do you suppose these lands were valued at? I have not read all the correspondence, because I do not wish to inflict too many of these documents on the House at this stage of the session, but here is the correspondence between Mr. Anderson and Mr. Fahrni, when Mr. Anderson was grappling with him for the purchase of the lands, in which Mr. Anderson was trying to persuade Fahrni that he had paid too much entirely for them, although in Mr. Fahrni's reply he stated that he considered he had got them dirt cheap. But if Mr. Anderson considered that Mr. Fahrni had paid too much for the lands, when he had paid $25,000 for them, I wonder what he thought, when he was making the transfer to the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), and when he made the sworn declaration that the lands alone, without improvements were of the value of $71,460. Seventy-one thousand four hundred and sixty dollars, Mr. Speaker! No wonder Mr. Fahrni said he had got them dirt cheap, although Mr. Anderson all the time was telling the poor man, when he was attempting to buy them, that he had paid the top-notch price and that he could not at that time sell them for the price he had paid. Mr. Anderson, through his agent, Mr. Kenneth Macdonald, who is a barrister in the city of Edmonton, makes a declaration in identically the same words as Mr. Anderson himself did, stating that the present value of the lands without improvements was $71,460. These were the lands which were sold to Mr. Fahrni for $25,000, $5,000 of which was paid down, and we have that man squeezed out of his purchase in order that Mr. Anderson might purchase them, and Mr. Fahrni only saved his skin by getting the amount he paid down in on the first payment. Then we have Mr. Anderson holding the lands for a few years and transferring them to his honoured father-in-law for no consideration whatever so far

as the transfer abstract shows, and the hon. gentleman who was the purchaser was able to raise $25,000 thereon through the Saskatchewan Savings Society.

Now, Mr. Fahrni, when all this information came to him, came to the conclusion that he had been,—to use a term I used this afternoon, quoting from Mr. Sifton when he said that Mr. Charles Millar had been buncoed out of the Blood Indian reserve—Mr. Fahrni came to the conclusion that he had been buncoed out of these lands, and he naturally took it very much to heart. He did not think he had had a square deal, and his son, on his behalf, directed a letter to the present member for Edmonton, on March 9, 1915, just about a month ago. Here is the letter:

Gladstone, Man., March 9, 1915.

The Honourable Frank Oliver,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I am writing this letter on behalf of my father, Christopher Fahrni, who was the purchaser of some three thousand acres of land in the Michel Indian Reserve, west of Edmonton in Alberta, in, I think, the year 1906. You are, I have no doubt, entirely conversant with all the facts in connection with the deal, so I will not need to go into same minutely.

I have been looking after my father's business, at least subsequent to and during the year 1910, and you will probably recollect that in June of that year, father not having kept up his payments on the Indian lands to the department, was threatened with cancellation.

At that time it was impossible for us to raise sufficient money to pay the department out for the land, and after receiving several notices from the department, father instructed me to make whatever deal I could with the land, as anything was better than nothing.

At this time we were suddenly approached by one J. J. Anderson of Edmonton, who after endeavouring to beat us down on the price as low as possible, succeeded in purchasing the land from us. We were under very great pressure of the threatened cancellation from the Government at that time, and felt that we seemed bound to sell at any price, or lose what we had paid. The whole proceedings of Mr. Anderson looked very bad to me in several different ways, but under the then existing circumstances I could not be a chooser.

Ex-Mayor W. J. McNamara of Edmonton has just come from Ottawa and has laid bare to us what appears to me to be a very infamous conspiracy, in which it appears that you, as Minister of the Interior, using the aforementioned J. J. Anderson who turns out to be your son-in-law, as a blind, made my father the victim.

I need not go into all the details as, as I have already stated you are without doubt familiar with same, but the letter which was written by your department notifying my father of cancellation for the sale of land had the desired effect on my father, and after receiving same he was prepared to do anything, in order to save whatever possible of the money which he had paid down.

[Mr. Roche.]

Just at this stage, your son-in-law's enquiries came to hand, and naturally we were ready to clutch at anything which would be of advantage to us, and we were prepared to sell at a sacrifice if necessary, provided we could give title. As soon as the question of our ability to give title arose, along came the notice from your department, dated June 7, 1910, in which you re-instate our contracts; thus making it possible for us to put a legitimate deal through and your son-in-law, through fraud and misrepresentation, with the connivance of the Department of the Interior, succeeded in obtaining the lands at about one quarter of their real value.

I was of the opinion that at the time of the sale to your son-in-law the land was worth at least $50,000 or $60,000, but your son-in-law insisted that the land was worth less than we had paid for it, and in the end, as I have said, he got it. I find now that the land at that time was as valuable, or more so, than it is now, and, further, upon obtaining a historical abstract of the land from the Land Registration Office at Edmonton, I find that the land has very recently been transferred from your son-in-law to yourself, and that you have raised a loan on same to the extent of $25,000, and that in the affidavits filed, requiring the value of the land to be set forth, same is sworn to be worth over $70,000.

It appears most conclusive to me that we have been defrauded out of some $50,000 which I have no doubt could be obtained by carrying the matter to a civil court, and it further seems to me that a perpetrator of a crime of this kind would also be criminally liable. What I ask, and which I must insist on having, is some restitution of this damage, and unless same is made immediately, all the documents shall be handed over to my solicitor for his attention.

I may say that a good deal of my information has been obtained from Mr. MacNamara, who has evidently spared no pains in unearthing same at Ottawa and elsewhere, and he has promised to give me his co-operation and all the help which he can give me, in order to bring this matter to a successful and just termination.

Kindly address all correspondence in this matter to me direct, as I am looking after this matter fully, and by the time this letter reaches you, my father will not be in Manitoba.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) Stanley H. Fahrni.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty strong letter, and if the statements can be borne out by the facts—and certainly a prima facie case has been made out by the record—I think it is none too strong. Certainly Mr. Fahrni apparently has a very great grievance against the department on the chain of evidence to which I have just alluded, which is set forth on the file, which is set forth in that letter which I have read, and which would strongly indicate that he had every justification for making these statements.

At any rate, what has happened? Five thousand dollars was paid in, and under the regulations $5,000 would have been

forfeited if the Government had allowed the lands to have remained cancelled; and not only would the Government have had the first cash payment of $5,000, but they would have had the land which Mr. Anderson swears is worth $71,000. So that the Government only gets $25,000 out of the deal, and there is a direct loss to this country of about $50,000. And yet these gentlemen opposite claim that they have been looking after the interests of the Canadian people and their lands; and in view of this the ex-Minister of the Interior passed a eulogy this afternoon upon the administration of the lands department by the late Government, and he thought it well to hand out a bouquet to himself as ex-Minister of the Interior, a bouquet which I submit, in the light of these events, is rather of a petrified variety.

I am not going to say that no restitution is coming to this Government, but apparently Mr. Fahrni thinks there is some restitution coming to his father for the manner in which he has been dealt with. I put this matter before the House in all sincerity, because I think it is my duty to do so. It is no pleasure to me to refer to these matters, because I am not of a combative disposition; but when we listen in this House day after day and week after week to the fulminations of hon. gentlemen opposite against hon. gentlemen on this side, turning and twisting every bit of evidence that is coming out in the committees and scattering it broadcast in the Liberal press throughout the Dominion of Canada, trying to hold the Government responsible for every lapse that has taken place in connection with the vast expenditure of money in the preparations in such a short time for sending the boys to Salisbury Plain, and making ammunition for themselves to do duty on the hustings, the time comes when patience ceases to be a virtue. Therefore I came to the conclusion that as a physician the only treatment I could prescribe was to give my hon. friends opposite a dose of their own medicine.

I am not going to monopolize more of the time of the House, but I may say that I have merely scratched the surface, because we could unearth very many more things without referring to Mr. Ferguson at all. Mr. Ferguson's work lasted longer than I anticipated it would last; but he has disclosed sufficient to show that this country has been despoiled of thousands of acres of land, of thousands of acres of timber limits, and of concessions handed out to the political friends of the late Administration; and this is something to know in order that we may take steps to see that there shall not be a repetition of it in the future and also to place ourselves in a position to demand restitution.

In regard to some of the things to which I have referred there may be some explanation that I know nothing whatever about, and as to which there is nothing on the files to show the contrary of what I have just stated. If so, we expect to hear it; but at any rate I thought it my duty as Minister of the Interior, when these matters were brought to my attention, to refer to them, in the face of the accusations made by hon. gentlemen opposite against members of the Conservative party; and there is no member of the House of Commons who has sinned in this respect more than my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) with those adjectives and that characteristic language of his, in accusing those of our party who have revealed any of these nefarious transactions as being black-mailers, porch-climbers, thieves and thugs.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROCHE: My hon. friend says, "hear, hear." This is the language used in this House by the ex-Minister of the Interior. When Mr. Ferguson and others have unearthed some of these nefarious transactions of such a villainous character that neither he nor any one else on the other side of the House can defend them, he refers to these gentlemen as thieves, thugs, black-mailers and porch-climbers. This is the gentleman who held the position of Minister of the Interior under the late Administration.

Mr. OLIVER: I am very sorry that I was too flattering.

Mr. ROCHE: We certainly have some idea of the hon. gentleman's capacity for using adjectives of a most pronounced character. We are quite willing to award him the palm, because for any one on this side of the House to try to rival him would simply be vain.

In view of the taunts flung across the floor of the House from time to time, I have simply thought it my duty to bring these matters up, although Mr. Ferguson did not deal with them. Had he been given a little longer time, I have no doubt that some of the matters to which I have just referred would have been investigated by him, but I think I have made sufficient investigation as to what is in the files to warrant me in making every statement

that I have made to-night. I do not wish to be strong in my language, no matter how great the temptation may be. I have not dealt with this question from a personal standpoint, because I have no personal feeling in regard to the matter. Were I to allow my personal feelings to weigh with me, I would say nothing whatever about these matters; but, being in charge of the department that has been under criticism by hon. members opposite during this session, especially by the ex-Minister of the Interior, I would be expected to do my duty, especially when he is simulating such righteous indignation against what has been exposed in the committees, in showing the character of the Administration which was carried on while he was Minister of the Interior and while the Liberal Government was in power. I think I have disclosed sufficient in the few minutes that I have spent in addressing the House this evening to show that the people of this country did not get rid of the late Government any too soon. The late Government has frittered away the public domain, scattering it out amongst its own political friends. In the light of such events, it ill-becomes hon. gentlemen opposite to attempt to criticise, as they have criticised in this House, the administration either of the Department of the Interior or of any other department of this Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have to say at once that I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the matters which have been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), followed by my hon. friend the present Minister of the Interior. I must confess my ignorance of the matters under discussion. On Monday morning, on looking over the Votes and Proceedings of the previous Saturday, I found that the Secretary of State had laid two returns on the table of the House. The record in the Votes and Proceedings reads as follows:

Mr. Coderre presented,—Return to an Order of the House, of the 22nd February, 1915, for a copy of the report of investigation held about June 1, 1914, by T. R. Ferguson, as special commissioner, into the allotment of homesteads on the area cut out of the Riding Mountain Forest Reserve in the year 1908 or about that time.

Mr. Coderre laid on the Table of the House, —Report of Thomas R. Ferguson, commissioner appointed to investigate matters pertaining to the Blood Indian Reserve and the acquisition of certain Indian lands by Messrs. James A. Smart, Frank Pedley and William J. White, together with the evidence taken in the said investigation.

[Mr. Roche.]

I sent at once to the clerk of the House for these reports, and he sent me, not the whole of the report which is now upon the table, but the report concerning the Blood Indian reserve. Looking at it, I found that the reference upon which Mr. Ferguson had acted was not to be found in the paper, and the following day I asked for it and it was laid on the table yesterday. I commenced to read the report; but I am sorry to say that I have not gone very far, for I have perused only some 20 or 25 pages. I had not the remotest suspicion at that moment that I would find my name mentioned in this report, nor had I any notice of it until I saw an article in the Ottawa Citizen of this date under the rather glaring headlines:

Western land deal with local end is laid bare—F. P. and H. A. Aylwin and J. A. Robert of Ottawa figure in irrigation case with big profits—negotiation through Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

I think it better, for the information of the House and the people and for all concerned, myself in particular, that I should read to the House the whole of this article, which is as follows:

A further report by T. R. Ferguson, K.C., brought down in the Commons this morning, deals with the Aylwin irrigation tract. The application, the report states, was made by F. P. Aylwin, of Ottawa, and the acreage was 69,000. The commissioner finds that E. A. Robert, of Montreal, was largely instrumental in obtaining the grant and that he benefited from it. J. Alfred Robert, of Ottawa, was another beneficiary. The report finds that Mr. E. A. Robert's services were enlisted for a consideration, and that he was paid $12,420 in that connection. The transaction took place in 1909. The land was located 75 miles west of Medicine Hat and in connection with the transaction the report finds that the Messrs. Robert and three others got $18,461 each. The commissioner states that it was not feasible to irrigate the tract.

Mr. Ferguson, dealing with the facts of the case, notes that it was necessary to procure the services of Mr. Robert. The application was made by Camille Piché, of Montreal, who was then a member of Parliament, and there were five partners: C. H. Newton, of Winnipeg, H. P. Simpson, of Vancouver, F. P. and H. A. Aylwin, of Ottawa, and J. A. Robert, of Ottawa. It was stated that the condition on which E. A. Robert became connected with the case was that his brother should have a fifth interest and he should be paid 18 cents an acre for every acre granted.

The commissioner states that according to the Order in Council $500,000 was mentioned as the cost of the scheme when it was proposed to grant 311,000 acres, and he adds that it was to cost the same amount when 69,000 acres were granted. If the tract could be irrigated he does not see why it was granted and goes on to state that some steps should be taken to prevent speculators acquiring irriga-

tion tracts and making profits by turning them over. This case he refers to as one destined to benefit individual promoters looking for enrichment.

The total amount received by Mr. Robert and his associates was $270,100 which, after providing for expenses and certain amounts paid to associates, left a profit of $92,329.

The commissioner is unable to find that the grant of this land was in the public interest. No great benefit could result to the public from the irrigation of 17,000 acres which was called for in the contract.

A letter is quoted under date of June 19, 1908, wherein Mr. Robert wrote that he had seen the "chief" and had a long talk with him on the matter. Mr. Robert expressed fears that others might try to get in over his head and he says he got the assurance that if he and his friends did not get in, no others would.

On June 19, 1908, Mr. Robert wrote to H. A. Aylwin in respect to certain other parties who he feared might get the grant. He expressed the opinion that they would not get it, but that he and his associates would and, if so, they would be dealt with "on terms acceptable to ourselves."

On March 18, 1908, Mr. Robert again wrote Mr. Aylwin to the effect that he understood Mr. Oliver had thrown open the tract to homesteaders. He added that other than being evident that Oliver had not been straight in the matter he would not let it worry him as the matter was in such shape that the grant had to be made or one of a similar size given. "I am going up to see Sir Wilfrid in a day or so," he added, "and perhaps shall have some good news to send you on my return. Keep your friends quiet until you hear from me and I am as certain as ever that you will get your grant of land. The delay has been very annoying and disgusting, but they are in a worse position to refuse it to-day than they were some time ago."

The commissioner observes that Mr. Robert's deals were not with the minister of the department, but with Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. R. Lemieux, and that twelve days after the 18th March, the minister took up for the second time consideration of Aylwin's application.

On August 14, 1908, Mr. Robert advised H. A. Aylwin that there was no further need to worry over it, that before many days there would be word that would be satisfactory.

Mr. Ferguson adds that the grant should not have been made until there was a complete investigation to see if the scheme was feasible. No engineers' reports were asked for and the conclusion he comes to is that the "insistent requests of Mr. Robert were the real reason for the grant."

The land was later transferred to the Alberta Land Company, organized by Mr. Robert.

That is the whole of the article. Now I come back to the headlines:

F. P. and H. A. Aylwin and J. A. Robert, of Ottawa, figure in irrigation case with big profits—Negotiations through Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

As to these Messrs. Aylwin, I do not think I know either one or the other. With Mr. J. A. Robert I may have a slight acquaintance. If I ever met him, it was not more than once in my life. Mr. E. A. Robert I know very well, have known him for many years, and have always counted him a friend. The gist of the charges in this paper is the following sentence:

Commissioner observes that Mr. Robert's deals were not with the minister of the department, but with Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. R. Lemieux, and that twelve days after the 18th March, the minister took up for the second time consideration of Aylwin's application.

There is an inference there, as stated in the headlines, that the negotiations with regard to these lands were through Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I have simply this to say —that to this statement there is not a shadow of truth. Whether the lease was right or whether it was wrong, constitutionally I am responsible, and I do not intend to deny the responsibility which attaches to me, as I was then of the Government. But personally I know nothing of this matter, and if I dealt with it at all—of which I have no recollection at the present time—it was simply departmentally in the absence of the minister. Mr. Robert speaks in one of these letters as having come to me and seen me. Mr. Robert may have seen me; if he says so, he did see me. This article says:

A letter is quoted under date of June 19, 1908, wherein Mr Robert wrote that he had seen the "chief" and had a long talk with him on the matter. Mr. Robert expressed fears that others might try to get in over his head, and he says that he got the assurance that if he and his friends did not get it, no others would.

I have no exception to take to that; I may have said to Mr. Robert that if he did not get it nobody else would, as he was the first applicant. Of all this I have not at the moment the slightest recollection. Will it surprise the House, will it surprise the Government, most of all will it surprise the Prime Minister, if I say that it is impossible for me, after six or eight years, to remember a private conversation which may have taken place in my office when I was Prime Minister? Everybody will know that the Prime Minister sees in his office ten, twenty, forty, fifty persons every day, coming with their grievances, some of consequence and some of no consequence; some to whom he will give attention and some to whom he will give no attention. It is a matter of daily occurrence for some one to come to the Prime Minister complaining that he has not had satisfaction from one of his

ministers; and it is also a matter of every-day occurrence, and a matter of common knowledge, that sometimes the Prime Minister deems it his bounden duty to interfere, but in most cases he does not interfere.

Now, in all fairness, if Mr. Ferguson had wanted to create the impression that I was in any way responsible—personally and not merely constitutionally responsible—that I had anything to do with the transaction right or wrong, I ask, in the name of fair play, in the name of common honesty, why did not he call me as a witness? I put myself in the judgment of hon. members on the other side as well as of those on this side. I have been for a great many years in public life, and up to this time I have escaped, I think, scandal. Have I not a right, then, if an accusation is to be bandied against me in the public prints, and on the floor of this House, upon the report of a commissioner, to say that at least this man should have given me the fair play of an opportunity of stating my version of the case? How can I be expected to give any information upon this subject? But I am satisfied of one thing—I have not had time to look at the evidence; my attention was called to this matter only two hours ago; but I should be very much surprised if Mr. Robert ever stated that I was an intermediary in connection with these negotiations. The evidence has been examined by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and, if they can find in it anything to that effect, I invite them to bring it to my attention. I have tried to find in the report evidence to justify the assertion that I was an intermediary in this matter; I find no statement, but some insinuations. I think I ought to read the conclusion of Mr. Ferguson's report; it is as follows:

So far as Mr. F. P. Aylwin, the nominal applicant was concerned, he was not considered. Mr. Robert was the active man. Again I say; if this tract could not be irrigated, why was it granted? It seems unaccountable, unless one concedes that it was to satisfy the requests of Mr. E. A. Robert and his associates. The claims made from time to time by him in his letters to his associates, in which he insists frequently that he will secure the tract; his actions in buying out the interests of Charles H. Newton, and assuming a liability of $23,600 and agreeing to pay $5,000 as a bonus after the tract had been thrown open to homesteading, all goes to show that he, at least, was satisfied that departmental action was of no importance—that in the end he would get the tract. He was not, it is true, aware of all that was going on in the department. At the earlier stages of the application, at any rate, he believed that there would be granted something over 300,000 acres, and apparently he did not for months learn of the practical cancellation of the tract. After he had learned of it, he persisted, and the small tract was granted. Even then he did not know that the irrigation privileges and rights no longer accompanied the grant, although they were a most material portion of the grant. Nevertheless, undeniably it was the efforts of Mr. E. A. Robert which procured the grant of the tract.

After a consideration of the grant of this irrigation tract, and of the tract of the Southern Alberta Land Company, I am of the opinion that there should be a change in the department in connection with the granting of the irrigation tracts. As is mentioned in my report relative to the Southern Alberta Land Company, I consider that irrigation tracts should not be granted to private individuals or to corporations, but that such irrigation schemes should be undertaken by the Government for the benefit of the country at large. If such a course is not followed, then there should be some regulation governing the amount of acreage to be granted, and providing also that no tract should under any circumstances be granted until the fullest and completest details as to the feasibility of the scheme are placed before the department and the department is satisfied that the scheme can and will be fully carried on to completion. Some course should be followed to prevent speculators acquiring tracts and making large profits by turning them over. All such profits form a charge upon the lands which the settler must ultimately pay, and certainly cannot be in the interests of the public at large. In connection with the Southern Alberta tract, no proper government inspection and report was made, the reports of engineers of that company were used when the stock was marketed and when the shareholders' engineers took charge and began to examine the scheme, it was found to be utterly impracticable as an irrigation scheme. This has all been discussed elsewhere, in connection with my report in that matter.

I conclude by saying that this seems to have been really a granting of this particular tract to individual promoters, who looked for enrichment. That they did not make very large sums out of it is not fault of theirs. If these applicants had been informed that the Government policy was such that they must bind themselves to irrigate, that they would not be allowed to sell or dispose of their interests, but that they must irrigate and begin the work and carry it on themselves, it is altogether likely that they never would have endeavoured to acquire this tract. In such an event, in this case, at any rate, these purchasers would not have acquired it, as they would necessarily have taken the trouble to learn, and have learned, that the tract could not be irrigated.

It is satisfactory to learn from this report that the country did not suffer very much if it suffered at all, in connection with this matter. I deny absolutely the charge that I was an intermediary, that the negotiations passed through my hands. Although my memory is a blank as to the circumstances, I say without hesitation that that charge is false. I appeal to the sense of fair play of every man in this House as to whether it was not the duty of the

commissioner, if any insinuations were to be made against me, to allow me to make an explanation in the matter. I would have produced my correspondence and allowed him to overhaul everything in order to find out the truth. Constitutionally, whether or not the transaction is wrong, I have to take the responsibility, and I do not intend to disclaim that responsibility. I am not here to ask favours from anybody; I am here simply to uphold my rights as a citizen of Canada, and to defend the good name which I have preserved through a pretty long life. As to what was done under the administration of the late Government, it is open to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to make what charges they can make, to find out what has been wrong, if anything, and to have restitution made to the Treasury if the Treasury has suffered by anything that we did. As I say, I am not here to ask any favours, but certainly, as a citizen of Canada and as a member of this House, I am entitled to justice and fair play at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): I have not had an opportunity of reading the whole of this bulky report in connection with the Aylwin irrigation tract, which has been debated this afternoon and this evening in the House, but my attention has been called to a synopsis of the report which was published by the Ottawa Journal. I have read that synopsis, and it is because my name happens to be mentioned therein that I wish to offer a few remarks in connection with this matter. I suppose this synopsis was carefully prepared, and represents substantially the evidence adduced at the investigation held by Mr. Ferguson.

Let me first read the evidence on which Mr. Ferguson bases the conclusion wherein he connects the name of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and my own name with this matter. I call the attention of my fellow members 9 p.m. to the evidence given by Mr. Robert in the presence of the commissioner, as follows:

Commissioner: Did you interview the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) up to that time?

Mr. Robert: Oh, I may have. It is quite probable I did.

Commissioner: What other members?

Mr. Robert: At this moment I can't recollect, but I think I may have seen Mr. Lemieux, the member for the district.

Commissioner: That is the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux?

Mr. Robert: Yes, it is quite probable I would go first to the minister of my district. I do not know in that interview that is referred to what minister I saw.

I quote the following from the same publication, dealing with the report made by Mr. Ferguson:

Twelve days after the date of that letter the minister took up for the second time the question of the consideration of Aylwin's application. Mr. Robert's dealings were not with the man who administered the department, but with two other ministers—Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux. His certainty that he could procure the grant is evinced by the fact that within a few weeks after March 18th, 1908, and with knowledge of the action of the Minister of the Interior, he purchased the interests of Mr. C. H. Newton.

Of course, I could leave the case as it is summarized here and take my seat, because I see nothing in the evidence to connect my name with this matter. First of all, Mr. Robert does not swear that he had seen me. He says it is probable he may have seen me, but he does not recollect. He says he may have seen the minister of the district. As a matter of fact, you will remember that in 1909 I was not what in political parlance we call the minister of this district or of another district; I was not, at all events, the minister representing the district in which Mr. Robert lived, the district of Montreal. If I was the minister of any district, I was the minister belonging to the Quebec district. I may say further that I do not know Mr. Aylwin and I did not know of the case until I read of it this evening in the Evening Journal. It is not possible for a member of a Government to remember all the Orders in Council that are passed, knowing that thousands are passed, I will not say monthly, but annually, by the Council. I did not know of that Order in Council. Mr. Robert never spoke to me, because I had no business with him, not being the minister of his district; and I never spoke, I say it with emphasis, to my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Oliver, then Minister of the Interior, as regards this transaction, and I cannot see how Mr. Ferguson can base such a conclusion on the evidence of Mr. Robert. Let me repeat again, to show how unfair are the conclusions of the commissioner.

Q. Mr. Robert, what other members did you see?—A. At this moment I cannot recollect, but I think I may have seen the Hon. Mr. Lemieux, the minister for the district.

I was not minister for the district.

Q. That is, the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux?—A. Yes. It is quite probable that I would go first to the minister of my district. I do not know in that interview that is referred to what minister I saw.

How in the name of common-sense, and in the name of fair-play could Mr. Ferguson conclude from that evidence that it was through dealings of the right hon. gentleman and myself that this case was promoted in the Department of the Interior? I say it again, I have had nothing whatever to do with it, and this is the first time I have known of this case—only this evening, by reading what has been published in the Ottawa press.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter it is not my intention to take up the time of the House for more than a very few minutes. You have seen the bulky reports that have been brought down within the last couple of days, and I think every hon. member on the other side of the House who is actuated by the ordinary spirit of fair-play will recognize that it is rather a difficult matter for any one to go through these reports and understand them on so short a notice. I am not going here to make any particular complaint of the report that Mr. Ferguson has brought down in so far as my name has been connected with a couple of these transactions, for the simple reason that I do not understand them fully, I have not had time or opportunity to go through them. And I want to say further that these matters have all engaged the attention of this House many years ago. I refer to those with which my name has been connected while I was Commissioner of Dominion Lands. As I have not been Commissioner of Dominion Lands for at least eleven years, it is all ancient history. It was brought up and dealt with in the House and before the Public Accounts Committee many years ago, and there is nothing new, so far as I know, in these reports. Therefore, I do not intend to take up the time of the House in going into them. If my hon. friends opposite think that by handling these reports and bringing up these old matters again they can do me any particular injury in my constituency, or do the Liberal party any particular injury, why, they are welcome to do so. So far as I am personally concerned, in my own constituency, they are doubly welcome to attempt it. They tried it once, many years ago, and did not make very much of it, simply because there was nothing much to be made of it.

So far as the Craven lands are concerned, and so far as the Brown lease was concerned, the lease was not issued until a year or a year and a half after I left the department. I shall not shelter myself behind that in any shape or form. The application was made while I was there, and it was all done according to the usual routine of the regulations. The only criticism, as I understand, that has been made is that the rental was not charged from the time the application was made. I venture to observe, and the Minister of the Interior will, I think, bear me out, that in no case is rental charged until a lease is granted. In this case the rental was charged when the lease was granted, but not for the time that elapsed between the application for the lease and the time that it was granted.

Some remarks have been made about the selling of the Craven lands at a dollar an acre. Let me point out that the application was made in the year 1899. If my memory serves me aright, the sale was made in 1900 or 1901. At that time it was the practice of the department, where lands in that district were sold, to sell them at a dollar an acre. A dollar an acre was the full value of the land. If my memory is correct—and I am not certain, because this happened some 12 or 15 years ago—some of these lands had been homesteaded twice and abandoned by the homesteaders because they could not fulfil the homestead duties, and because the lands were not worth taking out a patent for, in the judgment of the homesteaders. The lands were subject to overflow from Long lake. Some years the water would recede and there would be a crop of hay on the lands, but in many years there was not a ton of hay. At that time Mr. Brown, who subsequently bought the land, was a farmer in that vicinity. He was also a rancher. He went in for mixed farming. He had a large bunch of cattle and made application to purchase some of these lands and, under the ordinary routine of the department, he was allowed to purchase some 500 acres at one dollar an acre and he put script on some further area of land, totalling about 1,000 acres. Let me point out that at that very time the Regina and Long Lake Railway Company had a grant of one million or one million and a half acres of especially selected land, dry land, not land subject to overflow; and they were offering those lands at $1.25 an acre and could not sell them. Let me further point out that all through that part of the country where to-day the land is of the greatest value, down along the Sault line in the vicinity of Weyburn, later than the time these lands were purchased by Brown, the Canadian Pacific Railway sold hundreds

of thousands of acres for $2.50 an acre. Three or four years ago ordinary farm lands that had been bought for $2.50 an acre in that part of the country around Weyburn, Yellowgrass and up as far as Rouleau, were transferred at $60 and $70 an acre. Anybody could have gone and picked up the choicest quarter-sections in that part of the country at $3 an acre.

My hon. friend made the statement that this land that Mr. Brown had bought for $1 an acre was sold two or three years afterwards for $25 an acre. My hon. friend is mistaken as to the time that elapsed between the purchase and sale of these lands. They were purchased somewhere about 1901 and 1902 and sold nine or ten years later. There is nothing wonderful about that advance in value.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The sale, or the expropriation, is shown by the evidence to have taken place in 1906.

Mr. TURRIFF: The sale by whom?

Mr. MEIGHEN: By Mr. Brown.

Mr. TURRIFF: I have not the papers before me and the Solicitor General may have examined them, but I think he is mistaken when he says the lands were sold by Mr. Brown, or were expropriated in 1906.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The trial in the Exchequer Court took place in 1909.

Mr. TURRIFF: If the Solicitor General is right that the sale took place in 1906, then I am wrong as to the time that elapsed between the purchase of the lands and the time at which they were expropriated. But you must remember that the price of this land was fixed by the Exchequer Court. I was Commissioner of Dominion Lands at that time, and when the application came before me, as hundreds of others came before me, my decision was to allow Mr. Brown to purchase this land in 1901, or 1902, at the usual price at which lands were sold at that time, namely $1 an acre. I made those decisions in the absolute belief that I was doing exactly right and, after a lapse of ten or twelve years from the time that these transactions took place, I have nothing to take back and I am absolutely satisfied that I then was right. I have no reason whatever to think that I did wrong in my position at that time. It is a very simple matter for a commissioner to come ten or twelve years afterwards and make any sort of a report that he chooses. I am not complaining about the report. If he wants to make a report of that sort, well and good. We have the report and he has the money for making it. If the Government think it is worth while, well and good. As far as I am concerned, I have nothng to apologize for and nothing to take back in any shape, manner or form. I think I was in a better position to judge at that time than this commissioner is to judge at this time of what was a proper decision to come to on a matter of this kind ten or twelve years ago.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the report of Mr. Ferguson which has been placed on the Table of the House is a vastly important one. It comprises some eleven different subjects that have been under investigation by him for something over a year. It was laid on the table of the House as soon as we were able to lay it on and I can assure the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and all concerned, that there was not, and is not now, any intention to take any advantage whatever by reason of the time at which it was there laid. If it is their desire to have an opportunity later on for a fuller perusal than has been open to them, or for more ample discussion, I am sure that on this side of the House there will be no opposition whatever. Any suggestion that may come from them in that regard will be met in the frendliest spirit by us.

I have never been able to appreciate the force of the contention that because a subject is up before us for discussion at the latter end of a session necessarily it must be slurred over and improperly considered. The latter end of the session should be of as much importance to us, and its hours should be made as valuable to us and to the country, as are those of any other part. It is complained this afternoon that we have pretty much finished the other business, that the Estimates are voted, that even that long protracted consideration of the Act for soldiers' votes is over and that, inasmuch as we have no other business to transact, we cannot afford now to give time to the subject under discussion. I would have thought the argument would have proven the other way, that as we are now freed for the most part from the ordinary matters of public concern, we can devote our minds simply and solely to this subject and that there is no reason in the world to hurry until we are through with it, until all have had their say and have had time to say it.

I rise to address the House on the subject of this report, the debate having been introduced by the motion of the one hon. member of this House most concerned, the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). I arise in no spirit of personal antipathy to him, nor indeed to any hon. member concerned. Since I have had a seat in Parliament there is no associate in this House on either side with whom my personal relations have been more cordial than they have been with the hon. member for Edmonton. At the same time the subjects in the discussion of which his name appears are subjects of public concern and we would never do our duty if by reason of any personal relations we omitted to state the plain facts that appear in those subjects and make known to the country our opinions and the course of conduct we intend to take regarding them.

It is complained on the other hand by the hon. member for Assinaboia (Mr. Turriff) that he has not had time to review the report. The report, or a large part of it, has been on the table since Saturday morning last; the rest of it has been on the table since Monday morning last and it is now Wednesday night. His complaint also is that the subjects are too old and that in so far as his connection with them is concerned the discussion has very little interest for him at all because he is utterly unable to remember anything about these matters and that the records consequently are all we can rely on and if the records are against him he is satisfied and it has to go at that. We are not going to meet that objection of the hon. member for Assiniboia certainly by any further delay. The longer we continue the discussion the stronger the objection will become.

What are the subjects before us and why are they here? It was thought at one time that the session of Parliament upon which we are launched, and which is now nearing its conclusion, would be a non-controversial session.

If that had been carried out, if the Opposition had made it possible for the Government to have carried out that intention, then indeed, in my opinion, this report could not have been presented. But, has the course of conduct of the Opposition been such that it was open for us to choose? From the opening of this session to the close, their course of conduct has been such that never since the Government was returned to power has the spirit of partisanship been so aroused and excited as it has been by them. There is no trick of party controversy to which they have not resorted, and by means of their press chiefly, as well as by their speeches in Parliament, they have been endeavouring by distortion and by every other unworthy resort to cast aspersions on hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and to make for themselves weapons for an election. And if there is one hon. gentleman more than another who has addressed himself with assiduity to that task, and has never waited for the verdict of committees, and has never waited for the evidence, to come to a conclusion, but who has been ready in advance to find everybody on this side guilty of everything charged by hon. gentlemen opposite, and to denounce us with adjectives and language that he only can command, it is the hon. member for Edmonton. The language which he adopts to-night, in reference to the commissioner who has made this report—a report so fully substantiated by the evidence produced that even the hon. member for Assiniboia says he has no fault to find with it—the language he has adopted to-night in castigation of that commissioner has been equalled only by the language he has hurled across the floor at ourselves ever since the opening of this session. He tells us to-night that the revelations here laid before the people of Canada by Mr. Ferguson are so trivial and reflect so little on him and on the Government of which he was a member, and reflect so little on the department over which he presided, that it amounts in fact to a certificate of character upon which he is ready to appeal to the people of Canada.

I want to examine this certificate of character, and I take it that if this is the certificate upon which hon. gentlemen opposite purpose to appeal, then what is revealed here is the character of administration which the people of Canada may expect if they send hon. gentlemen opposite back to office.

The disclosures that are first revealed in the report have to do with lands in western Canada; they have chiefly to do with lands in the very district from which I come. I have not been unfamiliar for many years gone by with the character of transactions revealed in this first report. I heard about them in the last election contest: I heard more about them, in the contest that preceded the last. Throughout those campaigns, it was reported to me over and over again that we might just as well cease our

efforts to succeed in the Riding Mountain district and in the Dauphin country, because the homestead frauds perpetrated there were such that the Liberal party had a grip on the vote.

The right hon. the ex-Prime Minister tells us that the doings of his Government and of its departments are open to investigation, and that if we find anything wrong we have a right to reveal it and to demand restitution. Yes, the doings of his Government are open to investigation now; they became open to investigation on the 10th of October, 1911, when he threw down the seals of office and when the right hon. gentleman who now honours the post of Prime Minister took them up. But prior to that day, they were not open to investigation; prior to that day he and his followers behind him, over and over again, resisted motions, resisted resolutions, resisted every effort made by us as we sat in Opposition to have the very subjects which are here revealed investigated by committees of this House. Resolution after resolution, and motion after motion, calling for commissions to investigate these very subjects, were voted down at the right hon. gentleman's behest, and now because we have investigated them at the very first opportunity we had, the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) comes forward and says: there is nothing at all to investigate as regards several of them at least, because the men who committed the frauds are out of office.

What were these frauds in the Riding Mountain district? The hon. gentleman tells us that they are nothing in which the country is concerned at all. Why? Because he says that all these lands were open to homesteading anyway, and that if these fellows did not get them somebody else would, and the country would not have them, and, therefore, we have no concern. That is the attitude assumed to-day by the hon. member for Edmonton. There was a Riding Mountain forest reserve, that skirted the northern portion of my constituency, and the southern portion of the constituency of the member for Dauphin (Mr. Cruise). That forest reserve was defined by legislation of years gone by. It was found, according to the definition of that legislation, that there were large acreages that were not adapted to forestry at all, and that consequently should be thrown open for homesteads. The farmers of the district and all other districts observed—and doubtless some of them were advised in advance by hon. gentlemen opposite and by the minister of the day,—that it was altogether likely that certain portions would subsequently become open for homestead entry. Many became squatters upon lands in that district; some became squatters upon lands within the territory that afterwards became the restricted area of the forest reserve, and others again became squatters on lands which afterwards were thrown outside the new limitation of the forest reserve. With these men it became the duty of the ministry of the day to deal, and when it was determined to throw open for entry the lands outside the new restricted area of the reserve the squatters on those lands became entitled to priority of entry by virtue of the regulations then in force. There were squatters inside the new limits, there were squatters outside the new limits, and what was the policy pursued by the hon. member for Edmonton, then Minister of the Interior? He selects one of his henchmen, a man who was appointed to office for his services to the Liberal party, and one of the most pronounced partisans that ever infested western Canada, a man who to-day stands as admitting under oath that he used his office altogether to advance the interests of the Liberal party and for no other purpose at all; the then Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) invests this man with uncontrolled authority by letter, and he notifies the agent of Dominion Lands to the effect that W. A. Davis, a forest ranger, appointed by his Government, could go on his own will hither and thither, and any man that he recommended for an entry in that new forest reserve or without that new reserve should get that entry without any further inquiry whatsoever. Yet the hon. member tells us that that is something with which the country is not concerned at all, because, as he says, if he did not give the lands to his friends somebody else would get them. What did Davis do? He goes to the printing press and he gets printed several hundred orders addressed to F. K. Herchmer, Esq., saying: "Please permit Mr. —— to enter for —— lands, and this is your authority; signed W. A. Davis, forest ranger."

He hands these to Mr. Samuel Cohen and to Mr. Albert McLeod, selected, as he admits, because they are the very best party workers he knows, and these men take these blanks, and they utilize them as an engine of the Liberal party to award the public lands of this country to henchmen of the party in Manitoba. If there is a weapon within the grip of a Government

which illegitimately and illegally used will be certain to corrupt the electorate for election purposes, it is the weapon of these Dominion lands. Was there any restraint put upon Mr. Davis? There was not the least; he had the minister's own authority for what he did; the minister was at the Dominion Lands office at the time he did it, and the minister, sitting in the Dominion Lands office, wrote him a letter which ratified his authority to do it. He goes on with the work, and hundreds of men who had no right to entries whatever, are given entry for Dominion lands by the authority of the then Minister of the Interior of Canada. Amongst these men is one gentleman, now an hon. member of this House, a man who has done nothing wrong at all, says the ex-Minister of the Interior, but a man whom his own henchman, Mr. Davis, swore got an entry under that system to which he had no right whatever under the law. What does Mr. Cruise do? He goes up to the Riding Mountain reserve and picks up a good quarter-section, although the reserve is not thrown open for entry yet. Does he build a house on it and reside on it and become a squatter prior to the throwing open for entry? Not at all. He builds four walls without a roof; he does not live on the quarter-section for a day; and, after he gets the four walls up, he thinks that he has done enough, and he comes back to his farm in Dauphin; and up to the time he made his entry, yes, up to the time he got his patent, he had not lived on the quarter-section, and how could he be a squatter if he did not live on it? He gets the entry, but he is no worse than hundreds of others who get entries in the same manner; and the man responsible and the man guilty, is not half so much Mr. Cruise or the other men who availed themselves of the rewards of this system as the then Minister of the Interior, who permitted, authorized and ratified the system after he knew what was going on, and who accepted the results of the system in the election of 1908. Let me put this to the right hon. the leader of the Opposition: What does he think of the management of the Department of the Interior under his règime by the hon. gentleman Opposition: what does he think of the management is now shown to have been used by the then minister and by his henchmen for the purpose of electing the Liberal representative of Dauphin aud for no other purpose whatever? Does the leader of the Opposition think he is entitled to the votes of the Liberal member for Dauphin which have been given obediently at his command for the Liberal party in this House all through this Parliament, after he sees how those votes were got under the system which has been revealed? I suffered from this system also; men from my own county were promised by this man and by his henchmen homesteads in the Dauphin district if they would support the Liberal nominee. These promises were made over and over again, and I lost votes by them, and those votes were bribed and paid for under the authority of the hon. member for Edmonton. The letters are on record, and there are others here in the evidence which are not on record, but which are not essential to the proof. It is not a matter of dispute; the man who did this work swore that he did it and told why he did it. He allowed himself to be made a tool of his party; and when he was under oath, he was ready to admit it. He employed two men, Cohen and McLeod, because he said that they could not be beaten in the country for seeing to it that wherever the party would get an advantage, they would give it the advantage, and when he was asked: "were you not just the same?" the answer was: "Sure." He resigned shortly after the present Government was installed in office by the votes of the people of Canada, and I presume his resignation comes within the class of those complained of by hon. gentlemen opposite—those that were made under pressure and that amounted to dismissal, because, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, the men did not get a fair show at all. Yes, Mr. Davis resigned, and many others resigned under similar circumstances; but they were retained in office by the ex-Minister of the Interior after he knew, and after the records showed that he knew, the wrong which they perpetrated against the people in Canada and against the voters of that district, by his authority and under his supervision. Why did the hon. member for Edmonton retain Mr. W. A. Davis as forest ranger after he knew that Mr. Davis had disposed of lands of the people of Canada by the hundreds of acres, by the hundreds of quarter-sections, illegally, fraudulently and for political purposes? The hon. member for Edmonton is in the same position to-day as if he himself had acted the part of Mr. W. A. Davis, and had awarded homestead entries by the hundred in the Riding Mountain district in order to gain an illegitimate and illegal party advantage over his political

opponents in those parts. If he had dismissed Mr. Davis, if he had called him to account, if he had visited upon him any punishment whatever after he knew the facts, then he might have absolved himself. Did he know the facts? He did not deny this afternoon that he knew the facts; he knew of the deeds when they were being perpetrated; they were brought to his attention at the time, and the letters are on the file. He kept Mr. Davis in office, however, and he thereby added his seal to the wrongs perpetrated by Mr. Davis in that district.

But the Davis case is not all; the Cruise case is not all; there are ten more and they seem to grow in importance, each one over the one before it. We come next to the Pedley case. Mr. Pedley is dismissed, it is true, or he has resigned—I do not know which, and I do not think it makes much difference. Mr. Pedley has resigned and because he has resigned, the hon. member for Edmonton says: you do not need any report on this matter at all; why do you send Mr. Ferguson after Mr. Pedley when Mr. Pedley is not an officer of the department? Nobody knows better than the hon. member for Edmonton that, when Mr. Ferguson started out after Mr. Pedley, and when he acquired a knowledge of these nefarious transactions, Mr. Pedley was still Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and the reason why he does not hold that position any longer is this, that as soon as the facts were revealed by the Ferguson report, he threw down the seals and fled from his office as from a hissing snake; but he would not be out of his position to-day if it had not been for Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Ferguson's report, and according to the hon. member for Edmonton he should not be out of his position yet. Does he condemn the transactions of Mr. Pedley? Did he do so when he was on his feet this afternoon? No, Mr. Pedley had not one word of criticism at my hon. friend's hands. Speak about certificates of character! My hon. friend gave Mr. Pedley a certificate of character just as valuable as the one Mr. Ferguson gave him. Why, he said, Mr. Pedley is an honourable man; he can stand up and look the Prime Minister of Canada or anybody else in the face. He is a friend of Mr. Pedley's still. And, Sir, Mr. Pedley, the man found guilty on his own evidence, is to-day in the employ of the Liberal party, their organizer in Northern Ontario. Mr. Pedley is out of office to-day; there is no doubt about that. He got out of office very quickly, as soon as he was found out, and he will be out of office until a certain day and no longer—the day when the Liberal party is restored to power in this Dominion. Then he will get his reward the same as Wagner got his reward, the same as many others got their rewards, when the ex-Minister of the Interior was in office.

Mr. Pedley in the year 1902 received applications for grazing leases in the Blood reserve. He got one in December of that year from Mr. McLaughlin and Mr. Millar, of Toronto. These men were in correspondence with Mr. Pedley for this grazing lease. As a result of that correspondence and of an interview with Mr. Pedley of the 21st of April following they came to the conclusion that they were entitled to the lease and proceeded to arrange their affairs accordingly. They proceeded to secure a number of cattle to stock the land, and to employ a foreman and to prepare to take possession, believing that the lease was at hand and that they were the first and were entitled to it. What happened? The interview to which I have referred was on the 21st April. On the 22nd April an application comes in by Mr. Donald McEwan of the city of Brandon, asking for a grazing lease for the same land. On the 6th of the same month Mr. Pedley, at the request of a legal firm in Ottawa, acting supposedly for this same Donald McEwan, wrote Mr. McEwan a letter authorizing him to go upon the reserve and make any arrangement he could with the Indians inhabiting the reserve. It was apparently his intention, as far back as the 6th of that month, to grant this grazing lease to McEwan. On the 22nd, after he had written the letter, the application comes in. Now, this application of Donald McEwan is revealed by the evidence to be really the application of Peter Ryan, of Toronto, who used the name of McEwan and gave McEwan four shares of the stock of the company for the use of his name. Mr. Peter Ryan, of the city of Toronto, is shown to be a close friend of the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. So close friends are they that when Mr. Ryan is hard up he draws and kites upon Mr. Pedley, and when Mr. Pedley is hard up he operates through Mr. Ryan. Such is the evidence given by Mr. Ryan himself. That has been going on for some years. So Mr. Ryan comes along with the application in the name of Donald McEwan; and from that hour until now

Messrs. McLaughlin & Millar, those who have rights by priority, are hurled to the winds, and Mr. Ryan is the only man considered. Why? There is a declaration of trust set out in the evidence verbatim, produced and made an exhibit, which shows that Mr. Peter Ryan held this 6 per cent of the stock of the company that was to get the lease for Mr. A. C. Bedford-Jones, a lawyer of the city of Toronto. And there is a declaration by Mr. Bedford-Jones, who takes the 6 per cent, naming himself as trustee, and stating that he holds that 6 per cent for Frank Pedley, of the city of Ottawa—a declaration of trust not made in writing, and exposable in writing, but made by Mr. Bedford-Jones, according to his evidence under oath, and latterly admitted by Mr. Frank Pedley himself.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is Mr. Pedley?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Pedley at that time was the Deputy Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs under the Government of that day; he was the man who had the granting of these leases; he is the man who turned McLaughlin and Millar down, and took Mr. Peter Ryan, under the name of Donald McEwan, as the proper party to get the lease. Six per cent of the stock Mr. Bedford-Jones holds as trustee. These facts are brought before Mr. Frank Pedley in evidence. He is confronted with the declaration by the commissioner that he was the real owner of that 6 per cent. What does he do? He denies it under oath—never heard of it; did not know anything about it; denies it over page after page of the evidence. I can read his denial. I turn to page 15 of his evidence:

Q. Were you ever offered by Peter Ryan or any person on his behalf, or on behalf of Donald McEwan or Donald McEwan and Company, any interest in that privilege of concession?—A. No, never.

Q. And you never acquired any interest in it?—A. No, I did not.

Q. Do you know of any officer or official either in the Indian Department—I am putting it correctly, when I say Indian Department, am I not?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, do you know of any officer or official in the Indian Department who acquired any interest in it directly or indirectly either from Donald McEwan, Peter Ryan, or any person else?—A. I do not.

Q. Now, referring to these documents. I see in one of the documents to which I have just referred, dated 10th October, 1904, of which Peter Ryan of Toronto is the party of the first part and Alban C. Bedford-Jones party of the second part, Jones is set out there to be trustee. You see that, do you not?——A. Yes, I see that.

Q. I wish to know from you if you know for whom Jones was trustee?—A. I do not.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Q. Jones is on the face of that document apparently trustee for some person?—A. Yes.

Q. Now I ask you if you can help me to ascertain who that person is for whom he was trustee.—A. No, I do not know anything about it. The first time these documents came to us would be as per the date of Millar's letter, the 17th December, 1912.

Q. I see by these documents to which I am referring and in which Alban C. Bedford-Jones is trustee that he acquired from Peter Ryan as trustee six per cent of the total profits resulting from the enterprise which Ryan assigns him?—A. Yes.

Q. The enterprise referred to, as appears by this document, is the ranching enterprise on the Blood Indian Reserve granted to Donald McEwan?—A. Yes.

And later on:

Q. I put it to you that when Jones received that cheque of $1,000 from Charles Millar, he gave you, if not the entire sum, a portion of it, did he?—A. No.

Q. You say you had no interest in it at all?—A. I beg your pardon?

Q. You say you had no interest in it at all?—A. No, no interest at all.

Q. And you never received any part of that thousand dollars?—A. No.

Pretty strong evidence, pretty strong swearing by this gentleman who could look anybody in the face, even the Prime Minister of Canada. I quote further from his evidence:

Q. Then Peter Ryan was not indebted to you in any money at the time of the assignment of this 6 per cent interest to A. C. Bedford Jones?—A. Oh, no.

Q. So that that could not have been given by Ryan to A. C. Bedford-Jones in payment of any moneys which he owed to you?—A. No, it could not.

Q. Is it possible that Peter Ryan assigned this interest to you in the Blood Indian reserve to pay any moneys he owed you?—A. No.

Q. I am referring to the agreement between Peter Ryan and A. C. Bedford-Jones of the 10th October, 1904, and I show you the papers. That is the paper to which we have been referring in your examination this morning, which purports to be a copy of the agreement of the 10th of October, 1904, between Peter Ryan of the first part and A. C. Bedford-Jones, trustee, of the second part. This is the agreement to which we were referring this morning?—A. Yes.

Q. I am now saying that that was not given by Peter Ryan and could not have been given by Peter Ryan for any moneys he owed you?—A. No.

Q. Or for any indebtedness of Peter Ryan to you?—A. No.

It is apparent that no matter how often the question was repeated, he was ready with a denial of the suggestion that he ever had the slightest interest in that lease; that he ever had the slightest interest in Mr. Bedford-Jones's trusteeship; that he ever received a dollar from him; that on account of any business relations between

him and Peter Ryan there could have been an assignment of that interest for him, or a declaration of that interest as held in trust for him. I quote further:

Q. Was there any dealing between you and Peter Ryan or anybody on his behalf whereby you should receive or that anybody should receive on your behalf that 6 per cent interest? —A. No, there was not.

This is important evidence, in the light of the facts which are revealed a few pages further on.

Q. Had you any understanding about any per cent of interest?—A. No.
Q. With any person?—A. No.
Q. What does Jones mean when he says he remitted you out of the moneys which Charles Millar paid him, a certain portion of that money?—A. Well, it means I did not get it, if he remitted it.

Lost in the mails.

Q. Had you any knowledge that he was making a remittance to you of any money, or that he ever did make a remittance of any such moneys?—A. No.

What turns up a little later? Mr. Bedford-Jones is again examined; Mr. Bedford-Jones produces his cheques, and then the commissioner comes back to Mr. Pedley, who, as the hon. member says, using the words of Mark Antony, is an "honourable man." Page 28:

Q. Now, you got $1,000 in money; that is to say you got $900 in 1908?—A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Jones kept $100 for his services, which he charged against you out of the $1,000? —A. Yes.
Q. So that you practically got $1,000 of the money?—A. Yes.

Later he endeavours to make an explanation. Oh, he says, I was endorsing certain notes for Mr. Ryan, and I took this $1,000 as security that he would pay the notes. It is a form of business transaction entirely new to me—perhaps the hon. member for Edmonton has heard of it before—where a man who endorses a note for another takes the other man's cash by way of security. There is page after page of explanation here by this "honourable man" to the effect that Mr. Peter Ryan, instead of paying his debts, chose to draw upon Mr. Frank Pedley for a few hundred dollars and then pay Mr. Frank Pedley money with which he might have paid his debts. High finance! frenzied finance! but a form of finance thought of by Mr. Frank Pedley when he was giving his evidence, and not before. I quote further from his evidence:

Q. Does Peter Ryan owe you any money to-day?—A. Well, in that sense he does. I am on his paper to-day.

Q. To what extent?—A. I think it is three or four hundred dollars.
Q. If Mr. Ryan took up that four hundred dollars to-day or to-morrow, then you would not have to pay any of it?—A. If he took that up, of course, my account would be relieved to that extent.
Q. Then would Mr. Ryan be entitled to receive back the sum of $1,000?—A. As far as I am concerned, he would.

Here is Mr. Frank Pedley, an honourable man, holding the $1,000 which he says is Peter Ryan's, and holding it for fear Peter Ryan will not pay a $400 note upon which Frank Pedley is endorser. Did it ever occur to Mr. Frank Pedley that possibly $400 of Peter Ryan's money might have been remitted to Peter Ryan and that Peter Ryan could then have taken up his note and have become entitled to the other $600? I wonder why that never occurred to these great business intel-
10 p.m. lects, Mr. Peter Ryan and Mr. Frank Pedley. I will tell you why it never occurred to them: because the $1,000 was Mr. Frank Pedley's money; he got it for giving the preference to his friend, Peter Ryan. Does the hon. member for Edmonton believe anything else? He knew of this transaction. He has read the evidence; he gave some of it this afternoon.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not know of the transaction, and I did not read the evidence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman ventured to tell the House what the evidence showed; he ventured to tell the House that this $1,000 went to Mr. Ryan.

Mr. OLIVER: I told the House what Mr. Pedley told me, and I told the House that it was what Mr. Pedley told me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does the hon. gentleman say now when he finds what Mr. Pedley said under oath? Did Mr. Pedley tell him this after he gave his evidence?

Mr. OLIVER: On Saturday, if I remember rightly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of this week?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is when he was down here attending committees of Parliament in order to get campaign literature.

Mr. OLIVER: I guess he got plenty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he had waited a little longer, he would have got some more.

Mr. OLIVER: I think the hon. member is quite right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These are the doings of Mr. Frank Pedley. Because he was found out and because he chased himself out of the office as soon as he was found out, the hon. member tells the House that we should not have started the commissioner on his trail; that it was not worth the money to ascertain that a man holding a responsible position as head of the Indian Department of this country, under the Minister of the Interior, was a man of the calibre and character of Mr. Frank Pedley; to ascertain that the country was well rid of his services. Is $30,000 too much for that truth alone?

But Mr. Frank Pedley's depredations did not end there. He thought of another scheme. At the time he thought of this he was not Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, but he did hold an important office in the Department of the Interior. The other man associated with him was the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and had to do directly with the lands concerned in this transaction.

Did anybody ever conceive of such a scheme as this? Here is Mr. J. A. Smart, Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs in the Government of Canada, afterwards promoted for his efficiency, no doubt, to the office of Deputy Minister of Militia.

Here is J. A. Smart, charged with the disposition of the Indian lands of this country under the law and under the minister. He forms a partnership with Mr. Pedley, in the department, and with Mr. White, who has to do with some other branch of the service —immigration, I believe. They are the men who open the tenders in connection with the sale of Indian lands. They are the men and the only men—the public have no access or insight—they were the men who have access and insight into all data as to the value of those lands and who know the tenders that are received. They form a company, they employ the same Mr. Bedford-Jones, trustee, of the city of Toronto. First of all they do not become incorporated, they are just a body of associates, a sort of family compact. They go down to Mr. Bedford-Jones and arrange with him that, at a figure that they shall name and on receipt of their instructions, he shall put in tenders for 45,000 acres of Indian lands in the Moose mountains. And on a certain date, just as the time is up to close all tenders for Indian lands, Mr. Bedford-Jones sends a telegram to Mr. Smart: "Package received,—everything arranged for all right." I think I have that pretty close. The exact words are:

> Package received, suitable party procured, instructions understood. Complete matter tomorrow.
>
> A. C. Bedford-Jones.

Language intended to be mysterious, but indeed very clear to any one who has read telegrams of this kind. Afterwards Mr. Jones admits that the package received was a lot of tenders filled in by these same gentlemen in the office of the Minister of the Interior, the price at which they were to buy filled in. And then they, having hied themselves back to the city of Ottawa, open their own tenders and award the lands to themselves! Oh, says the hon. member for Edmonton, they had to be the highest bidder or they could not get it, and if they did not get it they went down the same as anybody else. They went down? They put in, I think, three or four hundred tenders, and all their tenders were accepted but eight or ten. What excellent guessers they were of the price at which they might get Indian lands!

An hon. MEMBER: Who accepted them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who accepted them? They accepted them themselves, they were the buyers and the sellers, they were dealing with these lands as trustees, dealing with the property over which they were trustees. These are the honourable men whose conduct in this matter to the hon. member for Edmonton is ratified by him and he declares that, having done it, they can look any man in Canada in the face. This is the man taken up by the Liberal party and sent over Canada to organize for their victory and his own victory and re-instatement in office at and after the next election. They did not confine themselves to the Indian lands of Moose mountain, they went into other lands. But in Moose mountain alone they bought some 45,000 acres of land and they paid for that land in November, 1901, $54,850. As I remember they did not pay up for quite a while after that; I think they paid it out of the sale price, putting up a little in the meantime. They bought it in November, 1901, for $54,850 and sold it in April, 1902, for $112,500. They make a profit on these lands of $57,150 in three or four months, dealing with lands for which they are trustees under the Government of Canada, dealing with them unfairly,

illegally, illegitimately as against other tenderers and as against the people of this country. They pocket the money, the result and the reward of their nefarious transaction, and they get the imprimatur of the hon. member for Edmonton for doing so. There may be fraud perpetrated under this Government, there may be parties in one extremity of Canada or the other who abuse the trust imposed in them; but there has been a Government in office since the 10th day of October, 1911, who, when they find out that these frauds are perpetrated and who the perpertrators are, do not stand at the door and block, do not render immune from punishment, do not reward for their offences, but who pursue them and punish them, and where legally possible, recover the money for the people of Canada.

Mr. PROULX: When has the Government done it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: When has the Government done it? There is one unfortunate thing, I do not know whether the hon. member for Prescott will be able to fully get his mind about this, but there is one unfortunate fact that the Government of to-day legally is the successor of the Government of yesterday; that when the Government of yesterday does a certain act and it is ratified by the then minister, the Government of to-day is bound by it. But there are men who do not come within the protection of that rule, and I do not think the hon. member for Prescott will be quite so anxious to spring the subject of restitution when he comes back to Parliament—if he ever does again.

Another transaction was referred to and admitted by the hon. member for Edmonton this evening. I do not wish to delay the House by going over all these matters; other members of the House have read them also. They have been exposed to view, open to perusal for days. But there is one matter to which I wish to refer because it has been covered in the speech of the hon. member for Edmonton. In the year 1905 the hon. member was and had been many years proprietor of the Edmonton Bulletin, a newspaper published in his own city, a newspaper which, since its inception, had been the personal asset, had been the personal organ of the hon. member for Edmonton. That has been known from end to end of Canada as his own personal organ, as the particular engine of publicity by which he has effected, from time to time, his recurring elections to this House. The Edmonton Bulletin becomes incorporated in 1905. The hon. member has an interest in it and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company come along and subscribe $15,000 to the Edmonton Bulletin and become stockholders to that extent. Now, what are the circumstances? Why did they do so? Is there any ground of offence, any cause of offence in that transaction? Is it something upon which the people of the country should look with favour or with frown, and why? The Grand Trunk Pacific was incorporated in 1903, incorporated for specific and definite purposes by an Act of this Parliament. I have read its charter and I am not able to find in it that a part of its purpose or a portion of its power consisted in running newspapers. I have not been able to ascertain even that it had the power, that it had the legal capability, of investing any of its funds in newspaper enterprises. But in the year 1903, they make a contract with the people of Canada, the most important, one of the most momentous and by far the most disastrous into which the people of this country ever entered; a contract by virtue of which they have extracted with regularity millions and millions from the treasury of this country. They make their contract in 1903, they secure a modification of the contract hugely to their own advantage in 1904. This they secured at the hands of the Government, of which the present leader of the Opposition was the head. They come back in the year 1905, they amend the contract again, they come back in 1906, and still important concessions are made to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Objection was taken to that contract from the first on the part of the Opposition of that day, strong objection was taken to it on the part of the distinguished leader of the Opposition of that day, but at every point at which the Opposition of that time sought to amend the contract in the interests of the people they were met with the assertion on the part of the then leader of the Government that a contract was a contract and that it was too late to change it whether to the advantage of the people of Canada or not. But it was changed. It was cast iron as against the people of Canada but it was soft and plastic as against the Grand Trunk Pacific. They came back in 1904, 1905 and 1906 and they got $5,000,000 of cash that had lain in the Treasury as security transferred and reincarnated into $5,000,000 of bonds, and they got the power to declare their parent, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to be the owners by virtue of an ad-

vance of $5,000,000 of the whole $25,000,000 of stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific. They come back in 1906 and got concessions still again and all the while, at the request of a member of the Government of the day, they are stockholders in the personal organ of the Minister of the Interior of that Government and they are contributors to the press campaign of the Liberal party to the extent of $15,000. What does the hon. member for Edmonton say? Here is an assertion in this report that a public service corporation, in whose transactions we are all interested, alienated $15,000 of its money, which it owned and possessed by virtue of the legislation we had given it, and transferred it into the treasury of the Edmonton Bulletin. But now, the hon. gentleman says, the people of Canada have no interest in that unless you are able to prove that, because they did that, because they made that contribution, the Interior Department, or the Government of Canada, made them some concessions. I want to ask the right hon. leader of the Opposition, who sat and listened to his lieutenant from Edmonton make that assertion and pronounce that doctrine, does he subscribe to it? Will he add the imprimatur of his great name to the pronouncement of his lieutenant from Edmonton? Does he believe that it is the right and proper exercise of legitimate politics, legitimate business, legitimate statesmanship or legitimate anything else that a public service corporation, at a time when it is having huge dealings with the Government of Canada, be asked for, and do contribute, $15,000 to the organ of a minister of the Crown? He makes no answer. He has stood on the floor of Parliament in this debate and he has failed to repudiate, and to put the ban of his disapproval on, the conduct of the hon. member for Edmonton. Did he know of it all the time? Had he known during all these years that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, who exist by virtue of the legislation of this House, who have drawn every year or almost every year of their existence millions from the treasury of Canada—has he known that while they were having these dealings with the Government of the day and were more or less dependent on the Government of the day for the successful prosecution of their enterprise, were the holders of $15,000 of stock in the personal organ of a minister of the Crown? We ought to show that they got that $5,000,000 cash transferred into $5,000,000 of American bonds or other bonds, because they put $15,000 into the Edmonton Bulletin? Does the leader of the Opposition say that that burden is upon us? Does he say so, or, in effect, does he tell us that because we find a man guilty of bribing a voter, or bribing a member of Parliament, we cannot prove any offence unless we go further and show that by virtue of that bribe the voter voted in a certain way or the member of Parliament gave the person who bribed him a concession? Does he subscribe to that doctrine? He will not, even nod approval of it. He knows he cannot; but he knows that he sits beside his own lieutenant who says that that may be done by a Government that may come into power, long years from now I hope. Fifteen thousand dollars of stock in the Edmonton Bulletin was held by a company, by a public service corporation, depending in a huge degree for its successful prosecution not only as a contractor but as a railway operator upon the bounty of the Crown, and at the same time a member of the Administration of the day under obligations to that company and a stockholder with that company in a political enterprise designed to keep the hon. gentleman's party Government in power! We are asked: What is the difference whether the Grand Trunk Pacific subscribed or the other fellow; the other Liberals around the city of Edmonton also subscribed? Perhaps many of us hold stock in newspapers—worthless stock a lot of it is no doubt—but it is a very different thing for a private citizen to hold stock in a newspaper and a public service corporation dealing with the Government of the day holding that stock and doubtless utilizing that fact, and the obligation which that fact entailed, to get favours from the Crown and the Government that represented the Crown.

The leader of the Opposition says nothing at all about the propriety of that conduct. I take it that he commends it. I take it that he knew of it. I take it that he knew of lots of others of perhaps the same quality and kind, because if this Grand Trunk Pacific had to contribute $15,000 to a paper of the size and proportions of the Edmonton Bulletin, how much was it compelled to contribute to all the newspapers from end to end of the country in order that the party and the Government which made with the company that disastrous bargain should be retained in power to the advantage of the company? Will he answer that? Will he trace the

Grand Trunk Pacific out and find in what other papers that company also had stock? I think the House might have expected a pronouncement on this subject from the leader of the Liberal party. I think the House and the country are entitled to a pronouncement. The leader of the Opposition has listened to this debate. He cannot argue—he did not argue—that he is not in a position to give an opinion upon it because he does not know the facts. The facts are admitted. He heard his lieutenant from Edmonton make the admission that in 1905, the year which above all others was the year in which they had the biggest grip upon the Grand Trunk Pacific, the year in which that company relied most upon the bounty of the Crown, that company had to come forward and put $15,000 into the Edmonton Bulletin. The right hon. gentleman heard the admission upon the floor of Parliament of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) who was the proprietor of that organ, that such was the case without doubt, but the right hon. gentleman stood up here and he refused to repudiate such conduct and to put upon it the ban of his disapproval. I am right in assuming, and the House is right in assuming, and the country will assume, until the right hon. gentleman stands in his place and repudiates his lieutenant from Edmonton, that he believes in that system, that he intends to persevere in that system, and that if he can he will press himself into power by virtue of that system. I have occupied as much of the time of the House as I feel I am justified in doing.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no subject comprised and treated of within the four corners of the Ferguson report that is not of as much importance, and that does not reveal just as astounding details as does this. But more than that; more than has been revealed within the four corners of the report, is the astounding pronouncement read from the files of the Interior Department to Parliament and to the country by the Minister of the Interior in this House to-night. What shall we hear about that? What will be the pronouncement of the leader of the Opposition on that? Can it be said that the hon. member for Edmonton made a mistake? I may say that I thought so myself when I first heard it. I do not think any member of this House was more surprised than I. If there is one man within the four corners of Canada who should have known and did know the facts, it was the head of the department who had to do with such transactions. One would expect that a farmer who got a patent for a quarter-section and who would read in his patent that the mines and minerals were reserved, would know that they were reserved, and every farmer does know it. One would have expected that the minister of the department, who himself reserved them, would also know that they were reserved. But one would certainly be doubly sure that he who was both the patentee and the minister would know that the mines and minerals were reserved. And knowing that they were reserved, and knowing that in these minerals he had no interest whatever, and knowing that he had no part or portion of proprietorship in these minerals, it is astonishing to find that the minister, who is the patentee, should affect to deal with these minerals, and did deal with them, and that he in his personal capacity, instead of as a minister of the Crown, receives a royalty month after month and year after year, and never accounts for that royalty. It is an astonishing pronouncement. I do not think there was any porch-climbing to get it; it was revealed on the face of the file. I do not know in that case who the thug was, but there it stands. It might never have been known if the hon. member had not come forward, when his Government were hurled from office, and ask for a lease of the mineral rights, but he came forward and asked for a lease in November, 1911, and that lease is there, and since November, 1911, everything is open to the face of day, and that revealed what had gone on before in Oliver's time. The minister never disclosed to the Crown, of which he had the honour to be a minister, and never disclosed to the people, of whose wealth and whose assets he was the trustee, that he was collecting and pocketing money that was not his but theirs, and to which he had no right.

I opened my remarks by saying that there was no necessity, and no attempt on our part to hurry this matter at all. It is a matter of pressing importance, and it is my desire, and I speak the wishes of hon. members on this side I am sure, that every opportunity to defend or explain be given the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), or any other hon. gentleman opposite —and I mention the hon. member for St. John merely because I see him at times coming close to the hon. member for Edmonton, and I know of no better wrecking-tug in the Opposition than is the

hon. member for St. John. It is our desire that the utmost opportunity of defence be given, and there is no purpose to the contrary. This is before Parliament, and almost this alone is before Parliament, and we on our part are prepared to stay here and discuss it, and if necessary to revive from day to day this discussion, until the fullest justice is done to all concerned.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John): I cannot fail to respond to the invitation of the Solicitor General to make a few remarks on this motion which was made by my hon. friend from Edmonton. I was not quite able to hear the description the Solicitor General gave of me, but I thought he said I was a good wrecking something.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Wrecking-tug.

An hon. MEMBER: He did not say you were a thug.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I may be able to rescue a good many things, but I do not know that I could rescue gentlemen on the other side of the House from the hole into which they have fallen this session. Whatever else I would be willing to do, I would be very sorry to undertake that job. There is something peculiar about these attacks which the Solicitor General and the Minister of the Interior have made to-night. I was particularly struck with the remark of the Minister of the Interior when he said that he was a man of peace, and a man of moderate views, and he gave the House to understand that he would not have made this attack upon the ex-Minister of the Interior if it were not for certain statements which had been made by the Liberal members of this House during the last few weeks. I suppose the Minister of the Interior was referring to the disclosures which have been made in the committee about boots, and the disclosures in the committee on public accounts about binoculars, and bandages, and drugs, and horses—

Mr. J. D. REID: And jams.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, and jams. I suppose that what the Minister of the Interior means is that in consequence of the very strong remarks which have been made by members on this side of the House and by newspapers in the country, he felt constrained to make an attack on the ex-Minister of the Interior, which he would not otherwise believe it to be his duty to make. That also explains the very warm attack which has been made upon the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) by the Solicitor General. In other words, they are trying to draw a red herring across the track; they are trying to divert the minds of the people of this country from the disclosures which have been made during the last few weeks by seeking to revive not only ancient history but ancient romance. The Solicitor General and the Minister of the Interior have referred to the report made by Mr. Ferguson, and they stated that it has been brought down just as soon as it was reasonably possible to do so.

Is this quite accurate? We have the fact that for about three years—scarcely long enough to earn $40,000—Mr. Ferguson has been engaged in these investigations, and we have a right to assume that many of these reports were ready a good many months ago and that many of them might have been laid upon the table of the House at the commencement of this session of Parliament; but it looks to me as if they had been reserved for some such occasion as this—as if hon. gentlemen opposite thought that there was scandal in the air in connection with these war expenditures and that disclosures would be made which would shock the people of this country, and as if they kept this report back until the last moment, hoping to bring it down at a time when there would be scanty opportunity of answering the arguments, when many of the members of the House had gone to their homes and when many more would have so completed their arrangements to go home that it would be at very great inconvenience that they could remain here.

Speaking particularly to the charge which has been made with respect to a homestead entry granted to Mr. Cruise, the hon. member for one of the constituencies in Manitoba, there is not any ground whatever for reflection upon the action of the department, because so far as the department and the late Minister of the Interior are concerned, all the requirements of the law were complied with. The allegation is that Mr. Cruise purchased upon credit some seven cattle in order to make the number up to 20, and that, alleging that he was possessed of 20 head of cattle, he was entitled under the law to a homestead entry. It is alleged that in respect of that Mr. Cruise deceived the department; but that shows no fault or irregularity upon the part of the department; it is a charge made against Mr. Cruise. That hon. gentleman, however, went home before this report was brought down, and to him it is very un-

fortunate and unfair that the report should have been held to this late date. Although my hon. friend the Solicitor General says, "we are prepared to stay here and give ample time for this discussion," he knows that upwards of a month ago the Government prepared for an early prorogation, giving notice of morning sittings, taking all private days for the discussion of Government measures, and also taking Saturdays. When this is done members begin to make preparations to go home, because they feel that prorogation will take place at an early date, and many members went to their homes before this report was brought down.

I am not going at length into these matters; but I want to speak of a charge made that there was an irregularity in connection with a sale of land to Mr. Brown in the valley of the Last Mountain lake. I want to speak of this, because when I have referred to all the facts which have been brought out by Mr. Ferguson, his including this in the list of these scandals which he says he has discovered during his long period of investigation, and it being one of the most important things which he was able to discover, when hon. gentlemen see the triviality of it and see how groundless is the charge which he makes, they will realize that there is very little in these allegations after all; because ordinarily in the case of an investigation of this character, particularly an ex-parte investigation as these were to a large extent, from one you can very well judge all. When you find that the commissioner has been straining at an effort to discover some one guilty in connection with this matter you can well believe that there is a distorted report in other matters. What are the facts in reference to this matter? To begin with, the quantity of land bought by Mr. Brown was not 1,000 acres, as I understood the Minister of the Interior to say, but only something like 500 acres.

Mr. ROCHE: I stated 530 odd acres at $1 an acre, and the balance making up 1,000 acres on which he placed half-breed scrip.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think my hon. friend is wrong as to the difference between 530 acres and the 1,000; I think. Mr. Brown was the owner of that land a considerable time before he bought the 530 acres. It will appear in the report of Mr. Ferguson that Mr. Brown was a very large farmer and rancher, owing 170 head of cattle, a large number of horses, and cultivating a large area of land, being one of the largest farmers in that section of the country. He had bought a very considerable amount of land from The Canada Northwest Land Company that had purchased, as my hon. friend knows, from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the original grantee of the Crown; he had bought from people who had obtained patents and altogether he was the owner of about 2,000 acres of land, a part of which was in the valley known as the outlet of the Last Mountain lake. A considerable portion of the land was on a hillside, and a large area of some 400 acres upon the level land at the top of the valley. He was using all this land together as being a part of his farm. Among the other pieces of land which he had bought, he had acquired out of section 5 in the valley at the foot of the Last Mountain lake 122 acres or thereabouts, which was the only portion of the section which had been surveyed for settlement or sale. When the land was surveyed, it was found that upwards of 500 acres of section 5 was covered by the waters of Last Mountain lake, and so worthless did it appear to the surveyors that they did not survey it, and they reported it to the department as land covered by water. When the Canadian Pacific Railway Company took their grant within the 20-mile belt, they refused to take any part of section 5 except the 122 acres by reason of the fact that the remainder was covered with water. When the survey was made, the valley of Last Mountain lake was usually pretty well covered with water for a long period in the summer. I know the country very well because I was there in 1883, and at that time the foot of Last Mountain lake was somewhere about four or five miles further to the south and east than it afterwards came. The water of the Last Mountain lake dried up to a certain extent and receded, as was the case with many other lakes in our northwestern country. The result of that was that after a few years, a portion of the remainder of this section 5 became so dry that a quantity of hay could be cut over a considerable part of it in some years; but there was always the danger of recurring floods, and the land was regarded as being of comparatively little value. There was a rule in the West, as it is the rule generally in all of the provinces of Canada, that where a man owns land fronting upon a lake or river, the Government will not grant what is called the fore-shore of the lake or river to any one but the riparian owner. That land was left there; and when Mr. Brown as the

riparian owner of these 122 acres applied for the land, it was recognized that he was the proper person to whom the title should be given, if he were willing to pay the ordinary price for land of that quality. After considerable inquiry the value of the land was fixed at $1 an acre, and at that price the land was sold to Mr. Brown. It will be found by the report that negotiations for the purchase were entered upon in 1900. This land formed a part of a very large farm, about two thousand acres, upon which Mr. Brown carried on large farming and ranching operations, on account of which it was desirable for him to get all the hay he could in the valley of the Last Mountain lake. As I have said, the Last Mountain lake had dried up to a considerable extent, and for a good many years all that section of country in the vicinity of the Last Mountain lake, especially the land to the West, was regarded as a dry section in which farming could not be carried on successfully. The railway, the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan, was built from Regina to Prince Albert, going into the valley of the Last Mountain lake, northwards to the west of the lake. And though that road was completed—and I was connected with that road—from 1890 down to 1900, there was no travel to speak of over the road, and it scarcely paid its running expenses. It did not pay interest on its debentures nor anything to shareholders, but barely paid expenses, though it was operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and operated as well as any good railway company could operate it. All that district lay stagnant. There were a few enterprising people like Mr. Brown, who engaged in general farming and ranching. They were excellent farmers and ranchmen, and they stayed on in the country in spite of the discouragements which drove many people away. It was not until 1900 that there began to be any development in that section of country. I venture to say that at the time when Mr. Brown bought that land, a considerable portion of which had been previously covered with water—dry in some seasons, but in others covered with water—one dollar an acre was the full value of the land. But what does Mr. Ferguson say with reference to the value? Does he say that this is too little to pay? Not at all; he makes no such charge, although from the argument of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche), one would think, if he had not read the report, that the land for which Mr. Brown had paid $1 an acre had been found by the commissioner to be worth much more. At page 162 of this part of the report, he says:

> Whether or not these lands in question were valueless—

Not pretending to know from the evidence whether they were valuable or not.

> —I wish to say that in my opinion the disposal of public lands without full knowledge is an unbusinesslike proceeding which ought not to be permitted.

That is the gravamen of the charge—that, even though this land may not have been worth more than one dollar an acre, even though the price obtained by the department may have been a good one, an improper course was pursued because it was sold without inspection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where does the hon. gentleman find those words—that the price received by the department was a good one?

Mr. PUGSLEY: No; he says:

> Whether or not these lands in question were valueless, I wish to say that in my opinion the disposal of public lands without full knowledge of their value is an unbusinesslike proceeding and ought not to be permitted.

I say that is not a finding on the part of Mr. Ferguson that those lands were sold below their value, it is an admission that they may not have been worth more than a dollar an acre. But it says that they ought not to have been sold without a thorough examination so that the department would know their value. Was there not an examination? When the lands were surveyed, the surveyors would go upon every section, and they would make a report stating whether the land was stony or free from stone; the slope of the land, whether towards the north or in any other direction; the nature of the soil, whether clay, loam or gravelly, and also whether any part of the land was covered by water. And in the files of the department, available every day to the officials, there would be found the report of these surveyors who made a careful examination of this land stating that only 122 acres was such that the Canadian Pacific Railway could fairly be called upon to take it, the rest being covered with water. Surely that was a report upon which the officials of the department could act; and when they were offered $1 an acre they were getting, as they thought, a fair and reasonable price for the land. As the hon. member for Edmonton has stated, at that time the very best land in the province of Saskatchewan was being sold at from $1 to $2.50 an acre. The rail-

way company to which I have referred sold their entire land grant, in respect of the first twenty miles of their railway, for $1 an acre and were glad to get it. Before 1902 the "American invasion" had begun. These experienced farmers had begun to come into that dry section of country. Having had the soil analysed and having knowledge of a process of farming in semi-dry countries which had then come into vogue, they were satisfied that the land in that country could be cultivated to advantage. As late as 1902, after so many thousands of Americans had come in and shown the capabilities of that country, the very best land, the pick of the land of that whole portion of central Saskatchewan, was under option to my knowledge for a period of three months at $1.50 an acre, and nobody could be got to take up that option or invest in the land. That is the very pick of the whole country which is now the garden of Saskatchewan. The fact that in the years from 1902 to 1910 land kept jumping up in value, rising at the rate of $2 an acre a year, does not prove that a way back before 1902 that land bought by Mr. Brown had any greater value than $1 an acre.

What happened later which caused the Government to expropriate? Both sides of the Last Mountain lake were rapidly settled by good settlers. One or more steamers having been placed upon the lake, it became necessary—because the water in the lake had fallen to a depth of five or six feet, making it too shallow for the steamers—to undertake a plan to place a dam across the creek which runs out of the lake, and so to hold back the waters and raise the level of the lake for the accommodation of the steamers and to permit the navigation of the lake. This is a lake of about 60 miles in length, and its navigation is desirable in the interests of the settlers. Besides, Last Mountain lake, being a large area of water, was calculated to become a great summer resort for the city of Regina —in fact, it has become such a resort. That is in a country where great lakes and rivers are comparatively scarce. Undertaking, as we did, the project of increasing and improving the navigation of Last Mountain lake, it became necessary to dam the creek, and in flooding back the waters of the lake we flooded the land owned by Mr. Brown and others at the foot of the Lake. So it became necessary either to pay damages and let Mr. Brown retain his land, or to expropriate the land and cause the Crown to become the owner. If I remember rightly—my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior will tell me if I am wrong—something like 1,200 acres of land owned by Mr. Brown were expropriated. Am I right in that?

Mr. ROCHE: That is approximately correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY: So that there would be 700 acres of land in addition to the 500 which had been bought some years before from the department at $1 per acre. I was Minister of Public Works at the time this expropriation took place, and I thought that it would be very much better to expropriate the land and secure an entire title to it than simply to pay damages and allow Mr. Brown to continue in ownership. In this way, the Crown could better go on with the improvements. We did expropriate the land, and it will be remembered that we took not only that land owned by Mr. Brown which at certain times, even before the dam was built, was flooded with water, but also the dry land, the best part of his farm; we took both good land and bad. The Exchequer Court valued the whole 1,200 acres at this price of $25 an acre, so that while he was getting an average price of $25 an acre a good deal of the land of which he had been the owner before he bought the land from the Crown was worth perhaps three times as much as the land which at certain seasons was covered with water. More than that, the expropriation of the land meant the breaking up of Mr. Brown's ranch and farming enterprise, because the taking away of 1,200 acres of his land would necessitate his farming elsewhere. Unless, therefore, one knows all these facts, one can hardly say either that the judge of the Exchequer Court allowed too much, or that Mr. Brown paid too little some years before for that portion of the expropriated land which had been covered with water. It has been stated —and no one ought to know this better than my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior —that land which in 1900 and in 1902 was not worth more than $1.50 or $2.50 an acre, even before 1907 had risen to $15, $20, $25 and, in some cases, even $40 an acre. A great advance in the price of land took place, because the people had begun to come in. No matter how good the land is, there will be no increase in value until there is an increase in population, because it is population that makes a demand for and increases the value of the land.

I should like to say just a word in reference to the Edmonton Bulletin. The con

missioner, Mr. Ferguson, the Minister of the Interior, and the Solicitor General went far afield to make a charge against the Minister of the Interior when they dwelt at length upon the fact that in 1905 the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company took stock in the Edmonton Bulletin. One would think, to hear these gentlemen talk, that this is the first great railway company that ever took stock in a newspaper. I remember when the late Peter Mitchell, formerly a member of this House and one of the most honourable gentlemen in this country—a gentleman who, as my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows, stood very high in the estimation of the people of New Brunswick and who occupied a very influential position in the government of the country—was editor of the Montreal Herald. The Montreal Herald was supposed to be owned by one of the railway companies of Canada, a company which has during all the years of its corporate existence, had to do with the different governments of the day. All railway companies, as hon. gentlemen know, have business to do with the different governments of the day. All railway companies, as hon. gentlemen know, have business with the Government and with Parliament. But no one ever suspected for one single moment that Mr. Mitchell was thereby influenced or induced to show any favouritism towards that railway. I happen to know that in New Brunswick not long ago a railway company took stock in a newspaper. The fact became public; no doubt the same thing has been done privately on many occasions. So far as I am concerned, I never supposed that that circumstance would influence the proprietor of the newspaper in the way of extending any favouritism to the railway. What was the condition at the time the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company took this stock? The contract had been entered into in 1903, and the amending contract in 1904. So far as those interested in the newspaper might assume, the contractual relations between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Government of Canada were fixed and settled. It might have been different if at the time that the company were before the Government in connection with entering into the contract, they went to the proprietor of any paper who was a member of Parliament or a member of the Government and made a suggestion as to what they would do if their project were supported. But in this case nothing of that kind occurred; everything was settled. One can very well understand that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company would take stock in the Edmonton Bulletin without the slightest idea that that would cause them to be entitled to any favour from the member for Edmonton.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE: The contract was modified in 1906.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, but the modification was of the very slightest character; it was one which was not in contemplation in 1905. Hon. gentlemen may ask, as the Minister of the Interior did ask, why the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company took stock in the Edmonton Bulletin. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was interested more than any other company in the development of the northern country, and in the development of the city of Edmonton. Is it not a well-known fact that real estate men establish newspapers at their own expense for the purpose of advertising the country in which they are interested? The more rapidly Edmonton was built up and the more widely its resources became known—and they could not be made known in a better way than through the medium of a strong, energetic newspaper published in the city—the better it would be for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. One can well understand that the enterprising manager of that company would be well disposed to encourage the existence and the successful carrying on of a newspaper in a city in which they were so deeply interested. If hon. gentlemen want to be suspicious, of course they can conjure up some sinister motive on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, but I think it cannot be said either that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company intended to influence the hon. member for Edmonton or that there is the slightest ground for suspicion that the hon. member for Edmonton ever was influenced by the fact of their having taken stock in the Edmonton Bulletin.

11 p.m.

The hon. Solicitor General says that as a matter of fact the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company did get favours from the late Government. I venture to say that there never was an instance in which the Government drove so hard a bargain with a railway company as it made with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company at that time. How different it was from the contract made by the Conservative Government with the Canadian Pacific Railway!

Hon. gentlemen know what concessions were made, I will not go into them; but with the Grand Trunk Pacific there was not an acre of land given, not an acre of land which they could sell to settlers, not an acre of land which they could divide up into city, town or village lots, not one. In that respect they were treated in a manner wholly different from that in which the Canadian Pacific railway were treated. They were compelled to pay, by way of rental, interest on the entire cost of the road after the expiration of seven years from the time of construction. I say that was a hard bargain which the Government made with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company; and never afterwards did they show any disposition to treat that company in any very lenient manner, simply doing justice to them, holding them to their bargain. Again, my hon. friend says: Why they came later on and they got $5,000,000 which they had deposited with the Government, in exchange for bonds of an American railway company. Now that is a specious statement for the Solicitor General to make—if you are to allow your imagination to lead you into drawing conclusions from a statement which really contains nothing. The Solicitor General does not say that these securities were worthless; he does not say that they were not interest-bearing securities; he does not say that they were not worth par; he does not say that they were not just as good as gold, or as bank notes; and yet, without giving you or this House the slightest information as to the value of those securities, he would rather lead you to believe that some great favour was given to the company because an exchange was made. Take the insurance companies doing business in Canada, they are required to put up security but they are not compelled to put up gold; they are allowed to put up securities in the way of bonds, Canadian, American or British, so long as they have a market value equal to the amount of the security which they are required to give.

Now, with regard to the Alberta Land Company. I must confess that I am not able to follow the commissioner or the Minister of the Interior in the suggestion that the department was guilty of wrong-doing in connection with the Alberta Land Company. The fact is that that company, according to his own admission, have expended $6,000,000 upon the enterprise in which they are engaged; and that very soon they will have that undertaking completed and will have so completed an enterprise which both Governments recognize will be of an enormous importance to the country. Then what is there to complain of? My hon. friend in some portions of his speech says that concessions were given to a company that did not put up any money; but he complains of the concession to that company because they have put up the enormous sum of $6,000,000 and have carried out their undertaking almost to a succesful conclusion, and he says that because of the hard times, because of their not being able to go on with their own means and complete the undertaking this Government have returned to them the sum of $150,000 in order to encourage them to complete this most worthy, most meritorious enterprise. That is the effect of what my hon. friend says. I would like to know, under those circumstances, what there is to complain of so far as the action of the department is concerned.

It seems to me to be another evidence of the fact that this Mr. Ferguson felt he had to earn his $40,000 in some way or other and that, if he could not find any good ground on which to condemn the late Administration, he must report upon matters in regard to which there was very little to complain of, hoping, I suppose, that the Minister of the Interior and those associated with him would take the bulk of his report in lieu of the quality and by reason of the many thousands of pages which he could obtain they would be satisfied, would never take the trouble to read it through and would pay him accordingly. A reference has been made to a lease of grazing lands in connection with the Blood Indian reserve. This House should always bear in mind that there is no allegation that the association of individuals who got that grazing lease did not pay all that the land was worth. There is no suggestion of that kind, there is no suggestion that it was leased by the department to them for one dollar less than it was fairly worth. The whole allegation is that the department turned down a gentleman, whose name I have forgotten for the moment, and gave the lease to a Mr. McEwan. They say that Mr. McEwan represented a gentleman in Toronto, Mr. Peter Ryan, whom I have always heard spoken of as a very worthy gentleman indeed.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE: Pretty tricky.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Have he and the hon. gentleman ever hunted together?

Mr. SAM. SHARPE: He was an auctioneer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have known some very respectable auctioneers. He occupies the very responsible position of registrar of deeds in Toronto. I have always understood that he is a gentleman of high character and he has been registrar for something like 25 years occupying the position under both Governments and it remains yet for somebody to make a charge that he has ever failed to perform his duties in a manner entirely satisfactory to the public. It is said that Mr. Ryan gave a one-sixth interest in this grazing lease to a Mr. Jones, and that Mr. Jones held it in trust for Mr. Pedley. That may be so or it may not; but this must be borne in mind, that the commissioner, Mr. Ferguson, as I remember reading the report—I do not confess to have been able to read it very carefully as I did not see it until this afternoon—but as I remember from my cursory reading, the commissioner does not say that he has any evidence which would show that up to the time of granting the lease to Mr. McEwan there was anything irregular or that the matter was carried on except in a straightforward way—not the slightest evidence which would justify him finding that and he does not find it. This is a fact which will not be disputed that, according to Mr. Ryan's evidence, Mr. Pedley had of late years been assisting him a good deal financially. Mr. Pedley had been endorsing his notes, he had been accepting his drafts and, as I remember his evidence, he said that years ago when Mr. Pedley was poor and he was better off he used to assist Mr. Pedley, but in later years the obligations had been entirely the other way, Mr. Pedley had been assisting him. And I would judge from the evidence that Mr. Ryan, having got this grazing lease, thought that he would put one-sixth of it in the hands of Mr. Jones as security for the meeting of his obligations to Mr. Pedley. That does not appear to have been communicated to Mr. Pedley at the time. The commissioner does not intimate anything of the kind and it is not entirely unreasonable that Mr. Ryan had done it in that way. At all events, we must be fair to a gentleman who has been charged with wrong-doing and, in the absence of evidence, we have a right to assume that he was innocent of any wrong-doing.

That appears to be the transaction. Later on, when the property was sold, Mr. Jones, who had had transactions also with Mr. Pedley, sent him the sum of $900. Mr. Pedley thought apparently that that was a return of moneys which Mr. Jones was owing to him in connection with other transactions. Afterwards they got together and both agreed that this would be the proceeds of the sale of this one-sixth interest. Mr. Pedley swears that when these obligations of Mr. Ryan, in connection with these notes and drafts, are taken up this money will all belong to Mr. Ryan. This is not a very important matter, but it does not appear that Mr. Pedley had any knowledge whatever that Mr. Ryan was holding this one-sixth share until long after Mr. Pedley could be of any further assistance as far as the lessee was concerned.

There are some other matters referred to with which I do not intend to take up the time of the House. But before passing away from this subject I want to say that Mr. Pedley's conduct came to the knowledge of Mr. Sifton who was then Minister of the Interior. Are hon. gentlemen going to declare before this House that they are of the opinion that Mr. Sifton would allow dishonesty in his department? I have heard pretty nearly every hon. gentleman here praise up Mr. Sifton to the skies.

Mr. HAZEN: No, not always.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not always, but of late years. I have seen the most eulogistic statements made in the newspapers of the Conservative party in regard to Mr. Sifton, and Mr. Sifton is a gentleman whom hon. gentlemen were apparently proud to follow in the fall of 1911. I know Mr. Sifton. I know him to be an honourable man, and when this was brought to his attention by a gentleman who had been a competitor for this lease, I do not believe that Mr. Sifton would so fail in his duty as to allow it to go uninvestigated at the time. I believe he did look into it and came to the conclusion that there was no wrong-doing on the part of Mr. Pedley. He continued Mr. Pedley in the responsible position which he was then occupying in the department.

I pass over this and come to a matter which perhaps might better be left to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) himself to answer. I would leave it to him of course, with full confidence that he would be able to answer to the satisfaction of this House. But my hon. friend is suffering from a cold, and he might not want to go into these matters to-night. Hon. gentlemen know how much affected his throat is. I would feel it my duty just to make

a reference to it in view of the statements which have been made by the Minister of the Interior and in view of the letter which he read to this House. What is the allegation there? It is that a Mr. Fahrni had purchased some 3,000 acres of land in the Michel Indian reserve in 1906, that after that gentleman had made his first payment of something like $5,000 for the land he had not been able to pay any more. Apparently he was not able to get people to put their capital into it because he was not able to raise any more money and he was in danger of losing the property. The suggestion of the minister is that the department at Ottawa, from some sinister motive, notified Mr. Fahrni that they would cancel the agreement for the sale of the property, forfeit the money which had been paid and resume ownership and possession of the property. Then it is stated that subsequently, by reason of Mr. Anderson, who was a son-in-law of Mr. Oliver, interesting himself in the matter and desiring to make the purchase, the fact that the department had cancelled the sale might be taken as evidence that they were bringing pressure for an illegal purpose upon Mr. Fahrni so as to enable Mr. Anderson to obtain the property at a very much less amount than its fair value. I think I have stated fairly what is the suggestion of the offence as made by the Minister of the Interior. If that were the design one would think the Department of the Interior would have continued in existence the cancellation of the agreement for sale until Mr. Anderson had consummated the deal and made the purchase. All the evidence is right to the contrary. The evidence is that the department rescinded the order of cancellation and rescinded it before Mr. Anderson had made the purchase. It appears from the letter which the hon. Minister of the Interior had read that when Mr. Fahrni sold to Mr. Anderson he had the notice from the department that the order of cancellation had been rescinded. Therefore, he was quite free to hold his land knowing that the department would wait on him for his next payment. Let me read the letter:

> I need not go into all the details as, as I have already stated, you are without doubt familiar with same, but the letter which was written by your department, notifying my father of cancellation for the sale of land had the desired effect on my father, and after receiving same he was prepared to do anything, in order to save whatever possible of the money which he had paid down.
>
> Just at this stage, your son-in-law's enquiries came to hand, and naturally we were ready to clutch at anything which would be of advantage to us, and we were prepared to sell at a sacrifice if necessary, provided we could give title. As soon as the question of our ability to give title arose, along came the notice from your department, dated June 7th 1910, in which you re-instate our contracts; thus making it possible for us to put a legitimate deal through and your son-in-law, through fraud and mis-representation with the connivance of the Department of Interior, succeeded in obtaining the lands at about one quarter of their real value.

What does that show? It shows that after Mr. Fahrni had got notice from the department that the agreement was cancelled by reason of his failure to pay, Mr. Anderson got into communication with him and he said that he could not deal with Mr. Anderson, but that fortunately there came notice from the department that the order of cancellation had been rescinded. He does not pretend that he had come to any agreement with Mr. Anderson before that. He certainly had made no sale to him before that, but the fact of his getting notice from the department left him free to make an agreement with Mr. Anderson, and it placed him in a position in which he could give title. Is not that an extraordinary thing if the department were desiring to force Mr. Fahrni to sell his property at a sacrifice? Is it not remarkable that if through the desire of the department, before any binding agreement had been made, or any agreement at all had been made, between Mr. Fahrni and Mr. Anderson, they should rescind the order of cancellation and so in effect notify Mr. Fahrni that there was no necessity for him to sacrifice the property, but that the department would wait upon him for the payment which was then due.

I do not know what the property was worth. One complaint of the Minister of the Interior seems to be that a great injustice has been done because the $5,000 that Mr. Fahrni had paid had not been forfeited and gone into the Treasury of this country. The Minister of the Interior talks about these different transactions in which he says great losses occurred, but let me tell him that if he puts all these together they would not in the whole amount to the value of that land at Prince Albert which was sold to Mr. Donaldson by the Department of the Interior after this Government came into office, for the magnificent sum of ten dollars. All put together would not amount to what was taken out of the Treasury of this country in that one land transaction, and yet the Minister of the Interior bemoans the fact that some $5,000 which

Mr. Fahrni had paid to the Government was not forfeited, but that Mr. Fahrni was allowed to get his $5,000 back.

There is another remarkable fact about this letter, and one which is worthy the attention of members of this House. This is a copy of a letter which was sent, not to the Minister of the Interior, but to Mr. Frank Oliver, M.P., and a copy of it evidently has been sent to the Minister of the Interior, in order that it might be used in this House on this motion. This precious letter is dated Gladstone, March 9, 1915, and I shall quote one statement from it:

> It appears most conclusive to me that we have been defrauded out of some $50,000, which I have no doubt can be obtained by carrying the matter to a civil court, and it further seems to me that a perpetrator of a crime of this kind would also be criminally liable. What I ask and what I must insist on having is some restitution of this damage, and unless the same is made immediately all the documents shall be handed over to my solicitor for his attention.

When I used to be practising law, the writer of a letter like that was called a blackmailer, and I have always understood that a gentleman who accepts a copy of a letter like that and endeavours to use it for the purpose of intimidating the person to whom it is addressed, becomes associated in that attempt at blackmail.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh!

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have always understood that to be the law. Let me read that portion of the letter again:

> It appears most conclusive to me that we have been defrauded out of some $50,000, which I have no doubt can be obtained by carrying the matter to a civil court, and it further seems to me that a perpetrator of a crime of this kind would also be criminally liable. What I ask and what I must insist on having is some restitution of this damage, and unless the same is made immediately all the documents shall be handed over to my solicitor for his attention.

And I suppose his solicitor has been handed a copy of this letter as well as all the documents, and the solicitor has handed them over to the Minister of the Interior. I do not know anything about what the writer of this letter states, but I am inclined to think that some degree of credit will have to be given to my hon. friend, that he has resisted this attempt at blackmail, and that he has in effect said to this man: If you have any claim against me, either civil or criminal, go ahead and take the matter into the courts whether you wish to resort to civil or criminal proceedings; you have no claim against me, no shadow of conspiracy can be substantiated against me, I will not be compelled by your threats to accede to your demands, go and do your worst. That is in effect what my hon. friend from Edmonton has said. And because evidence of wrong-doing has been made apparent to my hon. friend from Edmonton, as it has been made apparent to the people of this country, and because frauds have been committed in the purchase of war supplies, my hon. friend felt it his duty to denounce the wrong-doing, it has remained for the Minister of the Interior to lend himself to the efforts of this blackmailer who attempts to asperse the character of the hon. member for Edmonton.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT (Calgary): Mr. Speaker, at this very late hour I do not propose to trespass for any considerable time upon the patience of the House. It has been my privilege to be intimately acquainted with the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) ever since I went to western Canada, now some seventeen years ago, and I say in all sincerity that because of my relations with him, which were always friendly, I hesitate to discuss this report in the sense in which I otherwise would. It is not always pleasing to find that a public man in whom you have placed confidence is not worthy of the confidence you have reposed in him. It is not always pleasing to find that a public man whom you believed to be a man of integrity and probity is the opposite. It is not always pleasing to believe that those who have been charged with the administration of departments of the Government, have been unworthy of the confidence that has been placed in them and have been derelict to their duty. And, Sir, for those reasons, more in sorrow than in anger, I direct attention for a few moments to-night to the report which has been laid on the table of the House. I cannot but conceive this to be the end of the public career of the hon. member for Edmonton, as it should be the end of the public carrer of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff).

I should like to say to this House as one coming from western Canada, that those who live in eastern Canada have very little understanding of what has taken place in that country during the past fifteen or sixteen years. There are very few public men in eastern Canada who have taken the trouble to study the conditions under which we have lived; the conditions under which we were per-

mitted to exist by the Government led by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. During the fifteen years that Government was in power, what did they do? They were not content with taking the fishes in the lakes and granting fishing monopolies to their friends, but they took the waters in the streams which give life to the parched and arid lands of the plains and they handed these waters out to their friends to monopolize and to prevent their use by the poor. Not only this, but the timber and the trees of the forest they handed out to favourites, and to-day honest men in the Senate, whom we heard referred to the other day, are timber licensees throughout western Canada. Does my hon. friend say that if you cannot find the name of Tom Davis among these licensees you will not find the name of some other equally reprehensible senator? If you cannot find the name of a senator who has a timber lease or a water-power, you will find the name of one who has a lease of coal lands, which by some method he wrung out of the reluctant Minister of the Interior of that day. And, not content with exhausting the fish and the waters, and the timber and the coal, they had a scheme for getting the other mineral resources under the surface of the earth. The coal lands were gone, and when they were gone they issued grazing leases to their friends, their brothers-in-law, their uncles-in-law, their sons-in-law, and every other relation they could possibly conceive of. When you cannot get a son-in-law, you get some one else who will answer just as well and when you cannot get a brother or a cousin or an aunt, you get some one related in some way or other, and you hand him or her part of the public domain. During the fifteen years from 1896 to 1911 everything that could be done to alienate the public resources of Canada by conspiracy on the part of the hon. gentlemen who then were administering the country and their friends, was done. There is not time to-night to go into all the details, because it would take hours to do it; but I live in the province of Alberta, and I saw men with nothing, grow suddenly rich at the expense of the public. I saw the land of this country being alienated—graft is the proper word to describe the situation—by men whose corrupt ideas degenerated and degraded the public life of the country; and when an election came around, we found them acting as the camp-followers of the then Minister of the Interior. They were the porch-climbers and the thugs to whom he referred; they were the men who in 1905 and 1913 robbed and opened the ballot boxes of Alberta; they were the men who interfered with the sanctity of the ballot, and who did not permit the people of the province to express their will at the polls. I presume my hon. friend referred to them this afternoon when he spoke of porch-climbers and thugs, for they were the porch-climbers and thugs, and I engaged the time of a detective agency for two years until I traced to its source the opening and robbing of the ballot boxes by these men. I suffered from their work, because I was chosen by the electorate of the city of Calgary, and the ballots of the constituency were opened and the ballots abstracted and I was counted out. But one would think that it would be sufficient that all these things should have happened, but it was not. Lo, the poor Indians they must suffer! The wards of the nation! The aborigines of Canada! The men whose rights they were sworn to protect were the victims of the conspiracy of a Turriff, a Pedley and a White. If anything has ever in the annals of Parliament been placed upon the table of this House calculated to bring the blush of shame to the face of any Canadian, it is the revelation contained in the evidence that is here to-night.

Mr. TURRIFF: I would like to correct my hon. friend; I was never connected in any shape, form or manner, directly or indirectly, with the Indian Department.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman who has just spoken is quite correct as to not being associated with Mr. Smart and Mr. Pedley and Mr. White. He chose his brother-in-law, Mr. Adamson, as his associate.

As if that were not sufficient, my hon. friends opposite had to proceed to corrupt public opinion. One would think, Sir, that after having exhausted every known means by which to exploit the public domain to the limit, the fishes in the sea, the heavens above the earth, and the water under it, my hon. friends opposite would have been content. No, public opinion must be corrupted with a subsidized press. The hon. member for Edmonton, in his own person, stood here to-day, as the proprietor nominally and as the editor in fact, of a Grit journal that existed by the money of a great transportation and public service company for the purpose of corrupting public opinion. These are the indictments which this report makes against these gentlemen—conspiracy, fraud, dereliction of duty, breach of trust, and, above all,

a deliberate attempt and intent to destroy and corrupt public opinion. What, Sir, happened in Alberta? At the very time that the hon. gentleman from Edmonton was negotiating a little deal with Mr. Frank Scott of the Grand Trunk Pacific, at the very moment that he was inducing him by honeyed words to put $15,000 into his great journal, that great fireside journal, his henchmen had charge of the campaign in which the ballot boxes were robbed. If any man is curious to-night to know in what manner public opinion was dealt with during those days, let him go to the Parliamentary Library and read the Edmonton Bulletin of those days. Ah, Sir, I am a personal sufferer; I have been the victim of the $15,000 filched from this public service company; I have been the subject of the attacks of these hired assassins; I know whereof I speak, and I speak feelingly. The people of the province in which I live suspected that these men had not suddenly grown so wealthy that they had thousands of dollars to cast about the streets in maintaining this gang of camp followers who went to the polls throughout the province; we did not believe that they had suddenly found the wealth in the soil and dug it out and spread it around in this way; but little did the confiding electorate of Alberta believe that the great stalwart, sturdy, determined, outspoken, grimly honest man, as he said, had sold for $15,000 the independence of the press. What will they say when they find that these attacks that have been made upon the public men in the province in which I live, who do not see eye to eye with some hon. gentlemen opposite, were being paid for by a great railway company? When the hon. gentleman the other day in such measured tones deprecated the passing of the legislation that we were about to pass dealing with the Grand Trunk Pacific, when he expressed the great fear that he did that vested interests would be interfered with, that the credit of the Grand Trunk Pacific might be affected, little did we think that $15,000 of the money of that very company was speaking.

Ah, Sir, it is indeed a sad spectacle. A long career of great usefulness to his friends and himself is about ended. I have stood as chairman of a great public gathering and introduced on a Dominion Day my hon. friend the member for Edmonton as a citizen of whom we might well be proud; I have pointed out those sterling qualities that have made for him a great place in the state; I have pointed out those qualities of heart and mind that he had from the day when he crossed from Winnipeg to Edmonton until he sat here as a minister of the Crown, little dreaming that such a report as this would indicate how little warranted was my confidence in him. I speak the thoughts of the many thousands of the province of Alberta who to-morrow morning will read my words; when they understand that this their one time idol has feet of clay, when they find that those feet of clay are firmly embedded around about the Bonaventure station in Montreal; and when they realize just exactly what his obligation and duty are to the Grand Trunk, they will say: "Our idol has fallen." It was only fitting that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition should have entertained the same opinion, for to-night he deserted his one-time colleague and friend. Ah, well, my hon. friend from Edmonton after all was the heir to some of these things about which we have spoken to-day, and he did not create—nay, he only had to carry out. When one contemplates that, one might think that he would say with Wolsey:

> "Had I but served my God with half the zeal
> I served my King, he would not in mine age,
> Have left me naked to my enemies."

If he were not so disposed to think in the words of Shakespeare, he might have thought in the words of the Psalmist:

> "If it were an enemy that had done me this dishonour, I could have borne it; but it was thou, even thou, my own familiar friend. We took sweet counsel together."

Deserted in the house of his friends, flung to the dogs, forgotten, remembered no more. The right hon. gentleman who led the Government for fifteen years, and had him as his colleague for six, speaks no word of commendation, no word of defence, no word of recognition of the sterling qualities that endeared him so to the people of the West. Gone, forgotten, remembered no more! Peace be with him! And so he passes from the public life of Canada, forgotten, I take it, for his leader has forgotten him, remembered no more except for the wrong he has done and the legacy of evil he has left with us.

And now whom do we pass on to? We pass on to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). And who, contemplating that noble form in our public life, can fail to feel the force of the observations he made touching the public service of Canada? Who can fail to remember his

observations touching the British preference and other matters? Think of the way in which he discharged his duties as land commissioner, and his noble thoughts for all those friends of his who are remembered now not as common men, but as huge colossi, I suppose, who look down upon us poor common mortals. Millionaires! some are knights, and some are about to pass out into dark night forever. Let us deal with him. Why, when first I came into this House and ventured to raise my voice here, the first words I heard snarled across the House, were "C.P.R." Think of the hardihood of the man capable of doing that. And he talked about "unholy hands" the other evening, and called upon high Heaven to be witness to his honesty, his integrity, his nobility of character, his splendid fervour for the public weal. And did he think then of the Brown lease? Sir, some man we know not who, some hand we know not whose, between the time a certain document passed into the hands of the hon. member for Assiniboia with "32" written upon it changed that to "60" and it never went out of the clutches of the hon. member for Assiniboia. I should like—indeed, I should like —to deal with many of these matters at length.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. BENNETT: But I am not going to, because the hour is late. I want to make a few observations only touching the Department of the Interior in connection with one or two of the matters which have been mentioned here to-day. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has endeavoured to-night to support the position of his friend from Edmonton. With that sense of loyalty in which he is not lacking and which did not distinguish his sometime leader, he rallied his splendid talents to the support of his friend from Edmonton. But the woeful cry almost from the beginning indicated to us that it was not a congenial task; it was a work too great even for his master-mind.

There is one matter about which especially I desire to speak—the Brown grazing lease. What are the facts? A man named MacGregor, a beneficiary of the system came down to Ottawa and happened to run across a man named Brown. He said: "If I want a lease perhaps you will let me use your name. I have all the area I can hold in my own name." "Certainly," was the answer, "I do not mind a little thing like that; I live down in Montana." The application was put in. The hon. member for Assiniboia was Commissioner of Dominion Lands. MacGregor looked the thing over and did not think much of it. A man named Bell thought he would like to look into it. Later it transpired that a gentleman named Adamson thought it would be a good thing to get hold of. Mr. Adamson happens to be a close relative of the hon. member for Assiniboia. One good turn deserves another. Brown had sent in an application for 32,000 acres of land under a closed lease—and a closed lease in the terminology of the department, meant a lease that might be subject to cancellation after two years' notice,—and, under the control of the gentleman who now sits in this House and talks of "unholy hands," there came out an irrevocable lease for 60,000 acres.

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not know whether the hon. gentleman wishes to be fair or not, but he must know that that lease was issued a year and a half after I left the department.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, certainly that is so. The hon. gentleman realizes as he told us the other night, how poorly paid the civil servants were, and he too was in that case when he left the Civil Service; he was still poor on the occasion of his leaving the Civil Service. He left behind him this memorandum, that an application for a closed lease for 32,000 acres should become an irrevocable lease for 60,000 acres. And it was his handiwork and nobody else's. It is idle to try to get away from that. I have the evidence. He was summoned and gave evidence before the commissioner and explained exactly what happened. That evidence is too long to read.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read it.

Mr. BENNETT: No, it would take too long to read that evidence to-night. Hon. members themselves can see the bulk of it. He was not, as some one has said, taken unawares; he was confronted with the facts and given an opportunity to explain them; and his evidence as to how it happened is upon that record. It will be printed; it will be read by the people of Canada; but there is only one explanation the people of Canada can gain from it, and that is that anxiety to assist a brother-in-law brought about the change from 32,000 acres to 60,000 acres. That is the fact and no glossing over, no sophistry, no endeavour to get away from the real facts, can disguise this—that there was alienated

in the province in which I live a most valuable tract of land, one that should have settlers upon it. To satisfy the avarice and greed of a brother-in-law, 60,000 acres of the best land in that province was alienated on an application that went into the hands of the hon. member for Assiniboia as an application for 32,000 acres. And the lease is irrevocable, though the application was for a closed lease. I say that there is no explanation that can be given to the people of this country that can change the opinion in the province I come from that this was a deliberate act on the part of this machine to take from the people for the benefit of political favourites a part of the great resources that should be held in trust for the people and not for one or two political heelers and partisans. Why, Sir, there is only one person who benefited by the increase in that acreage, and that is Mr. A. J. Adamson, who was then after the lease. He concealed his connection with it from the department until July, 1905, when he sent to the department a quit-claim deed from this same man, Brown, to the Galway Horse and Cattle Company—which was Adamson, under another name, and enclosed a cheque for $650 for rental. Thousands of dollars of rental were left uncollected, for the rental was not paid between the date of the granting of the application and the issue of the lease in 1905. And the man whose handiwork this is, is the man who goes through the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta supporting the party of hon. gentlemen opposite and who dares to come into this Parliament and talk about "unholy hands." There may be travesties of justice, and there may be things that bring the blush of shame to Canadians, but what disgusts most men in Canada is the rank and arrant hypocrisy of some of our public men. The evidence is that this deed, which was brought to the department in 1905, was dated September, 1903; the name of the person to whom it was assigned was left blank, and this was afterwards filled in. Then what happened? The Galway Horse and Cattle Company was not in existence at the time of the assignment, nor was it in existence for some time afterwards. It was a company which was formed by Adamson for the purpose of holding this tract: that is embodied in the evidence that he himself gave. They allotted to the members of this little company their shares, and when Mr. Turriff—not as the hon. member for Assiniboia, but as the former Commissioner of Dominion Lands—testifying before the commissioner, was asked upon his oath to explain how the change respecting the increase in the area had been made, he could offer no explanation whatever. There is no doubt that he did it for Adamson, and Adamson, having decided not to go into the ranching business, turned the lease over for $22,500 to John Cowdry. All that it had cost Adamson for rental was $650; this he paid in July, 1905. The report showed that he should have paid $2,400 more for arrears of rental at that time, and that the department allowed the lease to be issued without demanding the money which should have been collected as rental—they practically made a present of $2,400 to Adamson and his company. I ask the hon. member for Edmonton, I ask the right hon. leader of the Opposition, whose supporters these gentlemen are: can any excuse be given to the people of the province of Alberta—Brown swears that he made no application and did not know that the lease had been changed until he gave his evidence before the commissioner—why that closed lease was changed to an irrevocable lease of 60,000 acres while the transaction was under the control of the now hon. member for Assiniboia? You may offer excuses; you may trifle with the truth; you may endeavour to palliate the effect, but there it stands, in all its grim reality. It was but one instance of the working of a system from which the people of western Canada suffered for fifteen years. I do not present that single instance as standing alone. The instances multiply; the illustrations increase. They are not isolated; they are not one here and another there; they are a continued, considered, persistent series of illustrations and instances showing a deliberate conspiracy on the part of a few men to enrich themselves at the expense of the people of that day and of the posterity that was to be. It was a deliberate attempt on the part of those men to filch from the settlers and from the settlers that were to come the public domain of the province of Alberta and to hold it until they could turn it over at a profit, as speculators and exploiters, to the loss of the people of Canada.

When you couple that single illustration, of which I have given the details, with the others that are dealt with in the report, and remember that in that province there is no voters' list—nothing but a system of enumerators worked by political partisans before the election—when you keep that fact in mind, together with the observations made

by the hon. Solicitor General, I ask, what elections have we had in Alberta or in Saskatchewan during the last fifteen years? The party press rejoices, and in flaring headlines holds up to the public the story that the Liberals won in Alberta and Saskatchewan; but I say that there has not been an election in either of the two provinces, since they became provinces, that is worthy of the name of an election. There has not been conducted under the auspices of the Conservative party in these western provinces a single election since 1896—and the population of those provinces was then but a few thousands, a handful of people. All the new settlers who came from across the line and from foreign lands across the seas have been brought into Canada and taught the damnable doctrine that public men holding high offices are there to corrupt, not always with dollars, but oft times with the natural resources of the country: a coal lease here, a fishing permit there; an irrigation right here, a quarter-section there. Then, when that failed, if the poor, untutored Indian happened to have a few acres of land, he was not free from the avarice and the greed of these Shylocks of our land. Is it any wonder that public opinion is outraged? Is it any wonder that the public conscience is aroused? Is it any wonder that when men went through the country
12 p.m. and spoke to the people from the public platform, they said: "these people are right at heart"; yet when the votes were counted on election day, the results were quite different? The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government went through western Canada and found a sound sentiment and a splendid response to the principles that he enunciated, but when the votes were counted, his candidates were always in the minority. Why? Ask Cruise and Davis and Turriff and Adamson and Oliver and Marshall, and that gang of freebooting buccaneers who went round the country as campaign followers of the then Administration. These are strong words, but these are the words which the dictionary says describe the men that I mention, and I know of no other language which I can use to do justice to the occasion.

This Aylwin tract affair is one of the most despicable transactions that was ever endeavoured to be put through in this country. I want to be fair to the hon. member for Edmonton. He protested as long as a man could, but finally, as compromise is the price of all government, he yielded, and to-night he pays the price of his yielding to his friends in the Cabinet. The Aylwin tract lies east of Calgary. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company several years ago was carrying on large irrigation works in that locality.

Suddenly there appeared one McGregor. I would like to traverse his history this evening and tell this House of that long and devious trail that leads from Brandon to the Yukon and from the Yukon to Medicine Hat and along through the Southern Alberta Land Company and then back to Brandon again; but I have not time. Suffice it to say that having conceived the idea that where water would flow down hill there might be a chance of making some money by using it on the arid lands of the province, he organized a company. It is a sad story. If I had time to tell of the English investors who paid 40 shillings in the pound for their shares that have gone to six shillings! I know of widows in England who put money in the South Alberta Land Company's stock. I know of the absolutely untrue statements contained in the prospectus, and how that money was obtained. I know of the sanction given by the late Government to the operations of the company. My hon. friend from Edmonton was not then minister, let us be fair. But that reminds me that there was not only Mr. McGregor but several other gentlemen. One of them is now in the Senate, my friend Senator Ross, of Moosejaw; he was there and Hitchcock was there, another relation of somebody's else's relation, and these men foregathered and conceived the idea of the company. They obtained certain concessions. They purchased certain cattle. The Grand Forks Cattle Company turned in its property. It is too long to tell about tonight, but they got their company and when Aylwin and his friends saw the splendid exploitations made by this company in London, when they saw the way in which the English investor caught at the bait held out about this irrigable land and what fortunes there were to be gathered from it, they said: This is not right, we want some too. You know there is nothing equal to the avarice that a transaction like that sometimes creates in human nature, and so Mr. Aylwin looked about and said: There is 350,000 acres of land not far from this tract in southern Alberta, and if we can get some water from the river for irrigation there is a fortune in it. So they came down to my friend from Edmonton; and on the 1st of August, 1906, he wrote a letter in which he said:

This is a very important matter. . . The question is one of engineering, which must be very definitely settled, especially as the area involved is considerable. You may rest assured there will be no loss of time in arriving at a conclusion in regard to it.

That was a proper course to take, the course you and I would expect any reasonable minister to take. He said that as it was a serious matter it required to be carefully considered. But that was not sufficient for Mr. Aylwin for I find on the 21st of September, 1906—mark you that the first letter was on August 1, and on the 21st day of September of the same year, when my friend the Minister of the Interior returned from a little trip to England, there was placed before him a memorandum by the then and now Deputy Minister of the Interior which will, I trust, direct the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the ignoble part he played in connection with this undertaking:

Ottawa, September 21, 1906.

Hon. Frank Oliver,
Minister of the Interior.

Memorandum.—I beg to submit herewith the papers in connection with the application of Mr. Aylwin for a tract of land in connection with his irrigation scheme. As per the terms of your letter to Mr. Piché, Sir Wilfrid instructed me to have Mr. Stewart make the inspection therein mentioned; his report is attached.

Peradventure there may be another Sir Wilfrid rather than our own right hon. gentleman, but at least his name and fame are not known to the Canadian people.

The memorandum continues:

On the receipt of Mr. Stewart's report the matter was again submitted to Sir Wilfrid, and he desired me to state to you that in his opinion the application should be dealt with in the same manner as the Robins' application, and that he would have granted it and passed the necessary Order in Council but for the fact that you were then on the ocean on your way home. On that account he thought it better to let the matter stand until your return, for the necessary action.

So that these gentlemen, having retained the services of a then Liberal member of Parliament, Mr. Piché, to act as their solicitor, after the hon. the Minister of the Interior of that day had instructed the engineer to make a report, during his absence had taken the matter up with the right hon. gentleman who was then the Prime Minister and Acting Minister of the Interior and he was prepared to grant that application, according to the statement made by the Deputy Minister of the Interior. But that is not all. I observe that these gentlemen found, when the hon. member for Edmonton came home, that he was not quite the easy man to deal with they thought he would be, because he said: I do not quite see it that way. He conceived the idea that he would not tie up those 350,000 acres for these people and he did something else. He said: "I am going to throw some of this land open to homesteaders"—and he did it. Mark you the determination of the hon. member for Edmonton; mark you the noble patriot desiring to assert and protect the rights of the people; for a year he did it. A whole year had gone by and the thing had not been put through. Behold this illuminating epistle from Mr. Robert of Montreal regarding this action of the hon. member for Edmonton:

Montreal, March 18, 1908.

H. A. Aylwin, Esq.,
Winnipeg.

My dear Aylwin,—Your telegram to hand, and in answer would say that I understand that Oliver has thrown tract open to homesteaders, but other than being evidence that Oliver has not been straight in the matter, I would not let it worry you unduly, as the matter is in such shape that they cannot but grant it, and will have to give you a tract of similar size, and I am satisfied that from my last interview the matter will be granted this session.

I am going up to see Sir Wilfrid in a day or so, and trust to have some good news for you on my return.

Keep your friends quiet until you hear from me, and I am as certain as ever that you will get your grant of land. The delay has been very annoying and disgusting, but they are in a worse position to refuse it to-day than they were a year ago.

I trust Mr. Newton is keeping better; give him my kind regard.

I remain,
Yours truly,
E. A. ROBERT.

That was in March, 1908. The general election was approaching; always, with stealthy tread, nearer and nearer it came, and, peradventure, far be it from me to suggest it, Mr. Robert may have been a prospective campaign contributor. Far be it from me to suggest it, but what followed? The hon. member for Edmonton, with that sturdy independence which characterized him on an occasion which perhaps he has forgotten, was still determined that he would not even then hand the tract over to these men, and so for a year he stood out. Mr. Robert felt confident of what he could do; he had only to see Sir Wilfrid. And so we find this letter, on the 27th of July, 1908, a few months later—the election was approaching nearer:

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 24th to hand, and in reply would say that I have no objection to

meeting Hudson, but rather think our best course would be to keep ourselves as free as possible until we get matters straightened with the Government.

I am supposed to have my interview with Sir Wilfrid next week to finish up matters, and will let you know the result as soon as possible.

With kind regards.

E. A. ROBERT.

This is the gentleman whom the right hon. gentleman hardly knows.

Mr. PUGSLEY: His brother.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, yes. This goes a step further, nearer and nearer comes the hour when the appeal was to be made to the people, and let us see what we find:

Montreal, August 14, 1908.

My dear Aylwin,—I have just returned from my trip,—

This was the trip to Ottawa.

—and am pleased to tell you that we have no further need to worry over it, and before many days you will get word from me that will be very satisfactory to us all.

That is very pleasing. That indicates that he had made a little trip to Ottawa and that he had seen his friend Sir Wilfrid. Mark you, the hon. member for Edmonton had come back from across the sea and my right hon. friend was not then acting as minister of the Interior. The minister himself had said: "I am going to let the homesteader have some of this land." So Mr. Robert did not go to him as he had not acted straight with him.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the system?

Mr. BENNETT: The system had not been working well just then. Mr. Robert wrote the following letter:

September 21, 1908.

I am in receipt of yours of 8th, but owing to my absence I did not get it till my return from Ottawa, and I intended writing you at once, but had to leave town unexpectedly the next morning, and only just returned.

I was unaware that Mr. Newton was on the note concerning deposit with Government.

I do not want to put up the money at present moment for this deposit, especially as the money lies at our credit in hands of Government and your Bank has transfer for same.

Then he discusses what is to be done:

On my last trip to Ottawa, I had the whole matter approved and accepted, and the order is on the table, signed by minister, and has approval of Government, and will be signed by Government and Governor General before November 1st.

Notice, about November 1. This is September. Why delay? Far be it from me to say what the reason was. October 26 was the fateful day and of course this waits until the 1st November. Then he says:

We have made note due November 24th to enable the whole matter to be finished, so that we will, I hope, be able to make a part division before that date.

The spoils of war!

I have spent a considerable sum already on this, and have assured its successful completion within a few weeks, and do not, under the circumstances, think it out of my way to ask you to put this through, when I give your Bank another name on note as good, or possibly better than the one they have now, and trust you will arrange matter.

This suggested a change in the name of one of the endorsers and gave the name of Westgate, who was said to be worth a quarter of a million instead of the name of somebody else. Mr. Robert said that he wanted eighteen cents an acre for his influence. I do not know what that word "influence" means. There is evidence that this term indicates an ability on the part of some gentleman to get very close to the ministers of past days and induce them to do certain things regardless of the public interest and the public weal. Influence and prices seem to have a fixed relation to each other. If the price of land is good the price of influence is high, if the price of land is low influence is cheap. If the lands of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Company are only worth $1.25 an acre the price of influence is away down, but if on the other hand, the price of land goes up then the price of influence goes up too. I do not know what influence was worth in the market at that time, but I know that in this case the influence of Mr. Robert was being sold at eighteen cents an acre and that they divided the spoils.

An hon. MEMBER: Cast lots?

Mr. BENNETT: No, they did not cast lots. They should have cast lots as to which should have gone out even as one in ancient times went out and made away with himself. What happened? As soon as these gentlemen got this land they incorporated a company called the Alberta Land Company, not the South Alberta Land Company. Robert and his associates then made an effort to hold up McGregor. It must have been a novel sensation for him. They went to him and said: We have this land. Oh, yes, says McGregor, but do you not know that I was ahead of you, that I saw the Minister of the Interior and I got all the water. You have the land and no water; what are you going to do about it? The minister had handed

these people out a lemon in the shape of land with no water on it. What a sardonic smile he must have had on his face when he sold them this land without any water! What happened? Alexander Smith, of Ottawa, now appears on the scene. I know this House has never heard of that little transaction which he put through. McGregor found the money to buy up the Alberta Land company, the result of which was that the 69,000 acres passed into the hands of the South Alberta Land Company. They had the water and they got the land. The right hon. leader of the Government seems to have been very anxious to put this proposition through, but in the absence of the Minister of the Interior he thought he had better wait until he came back. When he came back he found him very reluctant, very obdurate. He was, to use the words of an hon. member of this House, a bucking broncho from the West who, when driven to make possible the sale of this land by his Prime Minister, handed out this lemon in the shape of the land without the water.

There was another transaction in my country in connection with the Kananakis coal deal, in which there figured not only the names of Howard Douglas, two sons and his son-in-law, but two or three government officials. One of them never heard of the fact that he had ever been a great landed proprietor till the investigation. He merely signed his name, he did not know that anybody else signed his name in his absence, but as a result there passed out of the hands of the Crown a very valuable coal property that has since been sold for $500,000. There is another case not far from my own country in connection with the Blood Indian reserve which has been touched upon. Then they talk about these conspiring and culpable officials being dismissed. If there is one thing more than another that should convince this House that the Government of this country cannot be carried on by a Conservative Government with men of this stamp occupying administrative positions it is the evidence that was given by Pedley, by White and by Smart. I do not want to traverse the ground gone over to-night by my hon. friend the Solicitor General, but if ever there was a self-convicted perjurer, it is Frank Pedley. If there ever was a man who admitted that he had perjured himself in the endeavour to steal a few dollars, if there ever was a man who was a self-confessed perjurer and a criminal unfit for the public service of Canada, it is Frank Pedley. It is time for us to revise our ideas about this matter. I say as a supporter of the Government that they have been entirely too lenient with civil servants who have prostituted their positions. I say that all the wrongs we have had in this country, all the offences that have occurred since the defeat of the Liberal party have been the result, not of the actions of this Government nor of the ministers who compose this Government, but of the men who were occupying positions in the public service when this Government came into power and who have given evidence of the training which they had in former days. How can you expect men to be loyal to the public service who have been recreant to their trust in days gone by? You have the cases of Pedley, Smart and White. Smart has now left the service, but White is kept there against my protest. How can you expect a man of that type to discharge the duties and functions of his office when he has been recreant to the trust reposed in him by the people and the Government of the day? These men have admitted that they have committed acts which stamp them as being unfit for the public service; if men such as they are going to have the sympathy and support of hon. gentlemen opposite, what must the people of Canada think of them? I have heard men stand up here and take hours talking about dismissals from the public service, but no wonder the public service is rotten if you have hon. members opposite standing up and vindicating the position taken by a Pedley, or a White or a Smart. This thing must stop, and this report will enable it to be stopped. I cannot continue longer, for the hour is late.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. BENNETT: I am not making a speech about this; I only rose to make a few superficial observations. This all may sound to some hon. gentlemen to be a very light thing, but it is not. It strikes at the very root and foundation of our institutions. I do say, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, that I have endeavoured during the time I have lived in western Canada to play my small part in the public life of that country, and I have been disappointed, as many men have been, by reason of the various results in elections. I have taken the trouble to ascertain the reason why. I have seen men of integrity—at least, I thought them so—and of worth, and of character, succumb to the powerful influences, to the tremendous pressure that can be exercised upon them by reason of the facts to which I have directed attention. I appeal to the right hon. gentleman opposite, with his

forty-one years of parliamentary experience, to at least stand in his place, before this matter ends, and make a declaration that will make for the integrity and for the uplifting of the public life of Canada. I at least hope that as a result of these unfortunate revelations, and they cannot be less than matters of great sorrow and sadness to most men, good may come. Do you mean to say to me that a matter of this kind which strikes at the very existence of the body politic, is lightly to be passed over? You laugh when the member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) endeavours to do something to protect the poor red man, and you laugh because the red man's heritage is taken from him on the Blood reserve or somewhere else, and we talk about the glories of our democracy and the freedom of our franchise, but if men occupying high public places are permitted, with the approval of their leader, to go back to the electorate and ask for their support after they have been shown to be guilty of acts so nefarious, so dishonourable, so destructive to the morale of the community and so degrading to the national life, then there is absolutely no hope for democracy or for the proper development of Canada. I appeal to men, to whom, after all, love of country is greater than love of party, to read those reports as they are published. They are not partisan reports, they are not violent attacks upon men, or individuals, but a plain laying open to the perusal of the people of Canada of chapters in its national life that are degrading to that life, and humiliating to every man who calls himself a Canadian. That is the reason I ventured to speak in general terms of all these things dealt with in the report, and to direct specific attention to only one, or two, or three of them. We know what the hon. gentleman from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) pointed out with his camera in days gone by as to what took place with timber limits, and we know he was laughed to scorn. Why, Sir, look at the timber limits of western Canada and the men who own them. Go study the men; study these different coteries who got these limits by a system that could only be operated with the connivance of the officials, and that is so clear and so palpable that it does not require proof. Why, some of these men have the hardihood to appeal to the electorate, and some of them fold their arms smugly and say: What have you to say about it; we have the support of the people behind us. I do not often tell stories, but I will tell this one. Once in western Canada a man was charged with stealing a pig, and the evidence was clear, and a verdict of guilty seemed inevitable, but to the surprise of the judge and counsel, the jury filed into court and pronounced him not guilty. And when the prisoner was discharged his counsel said to him: "How do you account for this verdict?" and the late prisoner replied: "Say, that's easy, don't you know that each man of the jury had a piece of that pork?" And, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) comes back and talks of the magnificent majorities he has got in times past, I refer his electorate to the story of the Riding Mountain, the alienation of the public domain, which took place in his time, and then I think how the men who had a bite of the pork can be competent to judge between him and the best interests of this country. I would like to, and I shall do it later, review the evidence in these cases from my own provinces. I am content to place myself on record as regretting, perhaps more than I can say—although it may be of benefit and advantage to the party I support in this Parliament—my feeling of real sorrow and very great regret that these things should have happened in the province in which I live. I hopefully look to it, in fact I almost believe, that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, notwithstanding his connection with some who are guilty, will before this Parliament prorogues, in his place, give to the people of Canada some encouragement or some word that will indicate that regretting as he does the past he looks forward to a brighter future, although he has no hope or expectation of ever being in a position to duplicate the past.

Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I would claim the privilege of answering the personal references made by the Minister of the Interior, but I regret that my voice will not enable me to do so, and for that reason I shall not ask the privilege of the House. As the matter related to two departments, I brought in a recommendation to Council myself that a commission should be issued and a gentleman named for the purpose of inquiring fully into all the matters which had been alleged. The inquiry has now been completed, and I desire leave to lay upon the table of the House the evidence that was taken upon the inquiry and the report of the commissioner.

Motion for the adjournment of the House (Mr. Oliver) **negatived.**

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER read a communication from the Governor General's secretary, announcing that His Royal Highness would proceed to the Senate Chamber on Thursday, the 15th April, at 4 p.m., for the purpose of proroguing the present session of Parliament.

CONSTRUCTION OF DRILL HALLS.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: May I, with the consent of the House, lay on the table the report of Mr. R. A. Pringle, K.C., commissioner appointed to inquire into certain matters connected with the construction of drill halls at Orono, Meaford, Blackstock, Markdale, and other places in the province of Ontario. Information came to me some two or three months ago charging that certain irregularities and certain frauds had been committed in respect to these drill halls, some of which were under construction by the Department of Militia and some by the Department of Public Works.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As there has been no intermediate proceeding, this motion is out of order.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The motion is quite in order. There has been a proceeding which will be recorded on the records of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not a proceeding.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is a proceeding in the judgment of John Bourinot, because I have heard it so ruled by the Speaker.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.35 Thursday.

Thursday, April 15, 1915.

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

THE PURCHASE OF WAR SUPPLIES.

REPORT OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth), acting chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, presented the sixth report of the said committee, as follows:

[Mr. Oliver.]

Your committee have had under consideration the purchase of horses for the Militia Department in the province of Nova Scotia, and beg to report to the House the evidence and documents in connection therewith.

Your committee are of the opinion that the evidence respecting the purchase of horses in Nova Scotia discloses circumstances of such an unsatisfactory character that further investigation and action are necessary, and they recommend that the said evidence and all documents connected with the matters aforesaid be referred to the Department of Justice with instructions to make such investigation, and to institute such prosecutions and to take such proceedings as may be found necessary to protect the public interest.

And your committee further recommend that a further investigation should be made by the Government in regard to any irregularities which may have taken place in any other province of Canada, where such steps will be authorized and warranted by evidence or information of credible persons.

Mr. MORPHY also presented the seventh report of the said committee, as follows:

In view of the evidence adduced during the course of their inquiry into the matters referred by the House to them, your committee desire to draw the attention of the House to the requirement for the inauguration of a system of purchase, inspection and audit that will adequately protect the country from irregularities and frauds.

Mr. MORPHY moved:

That the third, fourth, sixth and seventh reports of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts be concurred in.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): The Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts during the past six or seven weeks has been engaged in the investigation of matters which have not yet been reported by the Auditor General to the House in the ordinary course of his duties, and which, therefore, have been under consideration by that committee a year in advance of the time when they ordinarily would come under its attention. The circumstances under which this was brought about are familiar to the House, and I need not dwell upon them. Certain correspondence with regard to the Accounts was moved for and brought down, and it was suggested that that correspondence ought to be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts. This was done, and the reference carried incidentally with it the right and the duty of the committee to investigate the matters referred to in the correspondence. There are two courses which a Government might take under the circumstances: one course would be to rely on technical considerations and rules, and declare to the House that such matters ought only to be investi-

gated in the usual way at the time appointed by law and under ordinary conditions. The other, and that which we thought to be the correct course, would be to open the door wide to the fullest and freest investigation, and we took that course for the very good reason that we deemed it our right, and our duty as well, to investigate and to know of any frauds or irregularities that might have been practised upon the Government and the people of this country. One can understand the possible result of such a course, because if any fraud or irregularity or imposition is discovered, even of a comparatively trifling character the natural and usual result is that it will be greatly magnified and exaggerated and will create in the people throughout the country a condition of unrest which may not be fully justified by the facts. But considerations of that kind ought not to weigh with any Government, and they did not weigh with us. Therefore, my direction to those members of the Government who were members of the Committee on Public Accounts was to make the fullest and freest investigation, and to permit inquiry into any matters whatever that might be desired by gentlemen on the other side of the House, or that might be brought to the attention of hon. members on this side. That course, I believe, was pursued to the fullest possible extent, as I will show by some references to the proceedings of the committee.

I may say, in passing, that this was not the course pursued during the fifteen years immediately preceding the time we came into power, because, without dwelling upon particular instances, I may be permitted to point out that from the time of the refusal, in 1898, of an inquiry into matters of the greatest possible importance in the Yukon until the last refusal to investigate matters of even greater moment in connection with the National Transcontinental railway, there seems to have been a disposition on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they held the reins of power, to restrict inquiry and investigation within the narrowest possible compass. I do not intend to go into those matters at any great length, but it is proper that I should call attention to a resolution which was moved by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) on the 13th day of February, 1908, and which is found in Hansard of that year at page 3070, the vote being recorded at page 3145. That motion is in the following terms:

The Committee on Public Accounts is constituted for the purpose of affording full and free examination and inquiry into the receipts and expenditures of public moneys and the circumstances in connection therewith.

That in the public interest the greatest possible freedom of investigation and inquiry should be enjoyed by the committee.

That any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence or restricting inquiry, should be subject to appeal to this House and upon request for that purpose the necessary report of proceedings ought immediately to be ordered.

That does not seem to lay down any startling or unusual standard of public duty; yet when that motion was put before the House by the hon. member for Peel it was voted down by the gentlemen on the other side of the House, then occupying the seats of office; and that motion of the hon. member for Peel to establish a most necessary and proper safeguard in the public interest, was denied by my hon. friends on the other side when they sat where we sit to day. Not only that, but in the committee itself inquiry was restricted in a very unusual manner, in a manner which it seems to me was not consistent with the public interest of this country. On the 9th day of May, 1906, a certain question arose in the Committee on Public Accounts. The Government of the day was represented on that committee by two ministers of the Crown; one of them, the Minister of Finance, the guardian of the public treasury, and the other the Minister of Justice, the man whose duty it would be, under the constitution, to take proceedings against any persons guilty of fraud against the Government of this country by raids upon the public treasury. Mr. George T. Merwin was under examination, and during his examination he was asked to state the price he had paid for an engine sold to the Government by him, and he refused to do so. Thereupon a member of the committee requested the chairman to rule whether the witness should or should not answer. The chairman of the committee, now an hon. member of the Senate, ruled that a business man was not obliged to divulge his private affairs. A member of the committee having asked the chairman to direct the witness to answer the question, and the chairman having declined to so direct him, the said member appealed from the ruling of the Chair; and the ruling of the Chair denying that right to a member of the committee, a representative of the people in Parliament, was sustained. Among others who voted on behalf of the Government of the day to deny that right to the representatives of the people in this

Parliament were the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance of the day.

If there was any wrong-doing in connection with public expenditure, and particularly in connection with the expenditure for the purposes of this war, the members of this Government wanted to know it; especially I desired to know it, and the Minister of Militia and Defence also. I spoke to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) who is a member of the Public Accounts Committee, with regard to the scope of the investigation. I spoke to him in the presence of the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major General Hughes) and I informed him—and my observations in that regard were emphatically seconded by the Minister of Militia—that we desired the widest possible scope given to that inquiry. If there had been any wrong-doing in connection with political expenditures, we desired it to be investigated to the full. We proposed that if wrong-doing should be discovered, restitution should be made and punishment should follow. And so the Minister of Customs in the Committee on Public Accounts adopted, as undoubtedly he would have adopted even if he had not been so informed by me, the course to which I will take the opportunity of referring the House. On the 24th day of March last Mr. Reid said in the committee:

I want to say that if there is any information the committee want, or any wrong-doing, then as far as the Government is concerned we want to ferret it right to the bottom; we do not want to shield any person.

And on the next day, the 25th of March, he said:

The Government is determined to protect fully the interests of the country in this and in all cases and to take such proceedings as may be necessary for that purpose.

And again on the same day he said:

I want to repeat here again that so far as the Government is concerned they want to prosecute their investigation to the very utmost limit.

And subsequently he said:

As representing the Government I have stated that we want to get to the bottom of these matters.

And on the 9th day of April he said:

I also want to say that so far as going into these or any other matters in connection with the Militia or any other department, the Government are not only willing but anxious to go into them from start to finish and get the true facts out in order that if there has been any wrong-doing, either restitution shall be made or prosecution be undertaken, to put matters right.

And later on, on the same day, the 9th of April, he said:

So far as these matters under investigation are concerned, or any others in connection with the Militia or any other department that have been brought up here, it is the intention of the Government to further the investigation and get to the bottom of every matter. We will follow this investigation from now on until we see exactly whether there are any other matters where there has been any wrong-doing.

On the 9th day of April some question arose about the investigation and the Minister of Customs again said:

I want to have it also understood that it is not the Government who are responsible for stopping any investigations.

Mr. Carvell : I thought we had put that very plainly.

Mr. Kyte : That is perfectly understood.

I now come to the matters that have been reported to the House by the committee. The one which appears first in my notes is that which is known as the Powell case.

Let me observe here for the information of the House and of the country that every one of the matters upon which the committee has thought it worth while to report to this House occurred during the first six weeks of the war, during a time when there was the greatest possible stress and urgency, and when it could not reasonably be expected that such attention could possibly be given to the safeguarding of the public interest as has been possible ever since that early stress and urgency passed away. The order for supplies in connection with what is known as the Powell case was given on August 24 last, and it is described as a rush order. Some evidence was given before the committee by a man named Shaver, who declared that he had been informed by Col. Jones, now General Jones, that the Government did not desire to purchase directly from manufacturers and producers, but that it desired to employ the services of middlemen. Evidence has been given by the Director of Contracts, Mr. H. W. Brown, by the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, General Fiset, by the Quartermaster General, General Macdonald, and, I think, by other officers of the Department of Militia, that no such principle or practice has ever been laid down or known in the Department of Militia and Defence since this party came into power. Further than that, one of these men—perhaps more than one—states that he does not believe that General Jones ever said anything of the kind, and I do not believe that he ever said anything of the kind. I say that

if General Jones ever did make any such observation to Mr. Shaver or anybody else, his conduct must be called into question by this Government, and if he is not able satisfactorily to deny the assertion that he used such language, he is no longer fit to hold a position in the public service. But, in the meantime, I do General Jones the credit of assuming that he never said anything of the kind. I shall not condemn him upon the testimony of this man Shaver, confronted, as it is, by the testimony of other reputable men in the department who are appointees not of this Government, but of the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite. I know Gen. Jones very well; he is a native of my own city of Halifax, and an honourable man, so far as I know him. He is the son of a man who filled an important position in the public life of this country, the Hon. Alfred G Jones, a member of Mr. Mackenzie's Government, and afterwards Lieutenant Governor of the province of Nova Scotia. I, for one, absolutely refuse to believe for a moment that Guy Carleton Jones ever told Mr. Shaver or any one else the absolute untruth that any such principle or practice was ever laid down by the Department of Militia since we came into power.

The transaction itself presents features of a very unsatisfactory character, as one is bound to admit at once. So far as I am concerned, I propose not to attempt to shield any one, Liberal or Conservative, but to mete out what I think to be justice to every man concerned in any of the transactions which have been under review. A purchase was made through Mr. Powell, a very young man, who was in the employ of a company known as the Carleton Drug Company. He was receiving a salary of $75 a month. His duties were very exacting, according to the evidence; he began his work very early in the morning and continued it until very late at night. He was enabled, under circumstances to which I shall refer a little later, to make a contract by which in a few weeks he received a profit of about $9,000, equivalent to ten years salary at the rate he was receiving. It is perfectly true that a portion of that profit, some $2,600, was withheld, through the vigilance of Mr. H. W. Brown, director of contracts, and it is also true that during the progress of the investigation before the committee a further sum of $6,300 was restored, after a motion had been made by the Minister of Customs recommending that the whole matter should be committed to the Department of Justice for such further investigation and proceedings as might be found necessary to protect the public interest. I desire to say that any further investigation that may be required for the purpose of further restitution, if any is deemed possible, and any proceedings of whatever character that may be found necessary to vindicate the public honour and the public interest, will be undertaken by the Department of Justice.

Let me read the report—because I should like to make the record complete—which the committee has made to this House with regard to the Powell contract:

> Your committee ask leave to submit to the House, the evidence taken in respect to the contracts for such supplies purchased from Mr. E. Powell, and to express their opinion, that the contract for such supplies do not appear to have been so worded as to fully protect the public interests.
>
> Your committee therefore recommend, that the evidence adduced, and all papers connected therewith be referred by the House to the Department of Justice, for any further investigation, if necessary, for the recovery of any moneys overpaid, the holding back of any moneys not yet paid over, and the taking of such further action as may be warranted by the facts.

That is the resolution which was moved by the Minister of Customs in the Committee on Public Accounts, and which was followed by the repayment by Mr. Powell to the public treasury of the sum of $6,300.

The committee has also reported to this House certain evidence and a certain finding with regard to binocular glasses. Their report is as follows:

> Your committee have had under consideration the purchase of binocular glasses for the Canadian expeditionary forces and beg to report to the House the evidence and documents in connection therewith.
>
> From the evidence it appears a number of binocular glasses were of poor quality, low range and inferior efficiency, but passed inspection and were paid for at an excessive price; and this was due to misrepresentation and inadequate inspection. Your committee therefore recommend to the House that the said evidence and all documents connected therewith be referred to the Department of Justice, with instructions to enforce restitution and to take such further proceedings as the law will permit.

It is not necessary that I should go into the facts, nor will the time at the disposal of the House under present conditions permit me to do so. The crux of the whole matter is that 166 out of the 2,175 glasses were of inferior quality and were not worth the money which the Government of this country paid out of the treasury for them

It is only fair that I should read to the House a letter which I received yesterday from a gentleman whose name has been associated with the matter:

Ottawa, April 12, 1915.

Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, G.C.M.G.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I note by the public press that a resolution has been adopted by the Public Accounts Committee, recommending that the purchase of binocular glasses by the Department ot Militia and Defence be referred to the Department of Justice, for its consideration.

As one of the contractors, I am very anxious that my dealings with the Ellis Company of Toronto should be thoroughly investigated by a judicial officer at the very earlist possible moment. I was not represented by counsel before the Public Accounts Committee, and I did not have an opportunity of presenting my side of the case in as complete a manner as I would have liked. If I have been guilty of any impropriety, either legally or morally, then I am extremely desirous than an impartial tribunal should so declare, and in such an event, it will give me great pleasure to make all the amends possible in connection with the matter.

I would therefore deem it a very great favour if you would kindly arrange to have the Department of Justice expedite this matter, and if the same is referred to a judicial officer, such as one of the judges of the Exchequer Court for investigation, I will facilitate and expedite the investigation, in so far as it is in my power. I would feel under very great obligation if such action could be taken immediately.

I beg to remain, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
T. M. Birkett, jr.

I pronounce no judgment on Mr. Birkett's relation to the case, but this seems a very fair and manly letter in which he desires an early and thorough investigation; and so far as the Government is concerned, it is disposed to give to him and to every other person connected with these matters the opportunity of that investigation and inquiry at the earliest possible moment. If unfounded suspicions have been cast on any person in this connection, it is only fair to them that the truth should be known. On the other hand if there has been any fraud or imposition practised on the Government and people of this country, not one moment's delay should be had in bringing the matter to the most thorough and careful investigation that can be provided for.

So far as the binoculars are concerned, I do not know precisely what the excess in price may amount to. But we propose to give, through the Department of Justice or by such other means as may be found necessary and adequate for the purpose, the fullest, freest and most searching inquiry into this matter that can be devised. If, on the one hand, any man's conduct has been impugned, if undeserved criticism has been passed upon him, let that be known; if on the other hand any moneys have wrongfully been extracted from the Public Treasury by excessive prices let us know that also. Further, let us take the most prompt and energetic means to provide that restitution shall be made and that persons guilty of wrong-doing shall be punished so far as the law will permit.

The next, and not the least important, subject touched upon by the Public Accounts Committee is the purchase of horses in the Maritime Provinces and particularly in the province of Nova Scotia. It seems that in August last it was necessary to purchase about 8,000 horses for despatch with the first contingent. Hon. gentlemen who remember what was transpiring at that time will not fail to recollect that there was urgent and emphatic demand from the country that the first contingent should be sent to the front at the earliest possible moment. That contingent was ready to go to the front fully organized and equipped within six weeks from the outbreak of war, although it did not go until a little later by reason of the necessity for adequate convoy. But any one who realizes what it means for a country with no greater military preparation than Canada had at that time, to arm and equip 33,000 men, in every branch of the service, with all the complex organization which forms part of a modern army—with guns, horses, rifles, munitions of war, all the sixty-six articles with which each soldier going to the front must be provided,—will realize that there was some haste and stress and urgency in the Department of Militia at that time. I should like it also to be remembered that we were entitled to trust, and we did trust, to the officers of the Department of Militia and Defence, the greater number of whom had been appointed by gentlemen on the other side of the House when they held the reins of office; and we had seen no reason to suspect that any irregularity would take place; nor so far as this part of it is concerned, do I know of any irregularity except a very great indiscretion on the part of one of the officers to which I will allude later on.

This reminds me, with regard to the binocular glasses, that the report of the committee complains of two things, viz., misrepresentation and inadequate inspection. So far as the misrepresentation is concerned, I have already informed the House that we propose to take immediate and effective proceedings through the Department of Jus-

tice to ascertain the actual facts. So far as the inadequate inspection is concerned, we depended upon an officer of the department who was appointed by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, when they were in office, as far back as 1906. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia has felt it his duty—and I absolutely agree with him—that, pending further investigation, he should suspend, and he has suspended, the officer who is responsible, if any one is responsible, for that inadequate inspection.

Let me come back to the subject of the horses. It was necessary to provide, in great haste, about 8,000 horses. I have taken up with my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence the general system by which horses are purchased by the department. He informs me that when he came into power he found a system by which persons selected by the Department were sent out to purchase horses, and the price eventually paid by the Government to them was supposed to cover not only their travelling expenses but the remuneration which they should receive for their services.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the Prime Minister repeat that?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand from the Minister of Militia that when he came into office he found a system under which men were sent out to purchase horses, and the price paid to them for the horses was supposed to cover their travelling expenses and also remuneration for their services. I am informed that there was no distinct dividing line between the particular price the country was paying for the horse and the amount that was being paid to the agent for his commission and travelling expenses. The price paid by the department to the agent so sent out represented not only the amount that he had paid for the horse, but also his expenses and his commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Agents sent out of the department?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Employed by the department. The Minister of Militia can make a fuller explanation; but just now I am submitting to the House the information he has given to me. He told me that the course which he decided to pursue was this: that the persons who were employed to purchase horses must be paid at a distinct rate for their services and their travelling expenses, and that for each horse purchased the Government must know the exact price. That was accomplished by giving a credit to some responsible person in whom the department had confidence, and that agent, together with a veterinary surgeon who accompanied him, and whose duty it was to examine and pass upon each horse, was authorized to sign cheques upon that credit so established or to give orders upon that credit. Under the rule which the Minister of Militia laid down, and which he understood was being followed, a cheque or order must be given for each individual horse, and the person selling the horse must endorse that cheque or order so that in respect of every horse purchased by the department, the Government would know the precise sum that it had paid. If that had been carried out, I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will say that very effective safeguards would have surrounded the purchase of horses for the Department of Militia. There you had, in the first place, a purchasing agent in whom the department had confidence; and, in the second place, a veterinary surgeon who was to pass upon the soundness of the horse, his age, and condition, and everything of that kind; and, in the third place, you had a cheque or order drawn to represent the price paid by the people of this country in respect of each horse, which was also identified so that there could be no palming off of any other horse for the one actually purchased.

It seems that during the course of this war an hon. member of this House went to Col. Neill, the principal veterinary officer, and urged that horses should be purchased in the Maritime Provinces seeing that they were being purchased elsewhere in Canada. I shall refer a little later to the statement in connection with this subject which has been given to me by the hon. member for Kings, N.S. (Mr. A. De Witt Foster). At all events Mr. Foster was employed to purchase horses in the province of Nova Scotia, and he did undertake the duties of purchasing agent. For this purpose, a credit of a very considerable sum, about $73,000, was established and eventually paid out for horses purchased in that province. The hon. member for Kings, N.S., was not the only person employed in the province of Nova Scotia or in the Maritime Provinces. Major L. B. Anderson purchased horses to the number of 195 in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The hon. member for Kings, N.S., purchased horses to the number of 428 in Nova Scotia. Mr. Walter Crowe and Mr. E. C. Thurston purchased horses to the number of twenty

in Cape Breton; and Mr. H. B. McLeod and Mr. E. C. Thurston purchased horses to the number of 116, somewhere in the Maritime Provinces, I do not know precisely where.

Mr. Foster was appointed as purchasing agent without the knowledge, consent or approval of any member of the Government. I knew nothing of it or I should certainly have absolutely prevented his undertaking any such duties. The Minister of Militia knew nothing of it; and he informs me that if he had had any intimation of it he certainly would never have consented that Mr. Foster, a member of this House, should undertake the duties of purchasing agent for the Government. Mr. Foster was appointed by Col. Neill, the principal veterinary officer, as were also these other gentlemen to whom I have alluded. And lest there should be in the minds of the people of this country the idea that political considerations influenced the Government in these appointments, I may point out that all the other gentlemen who were appointed to purchase horses in the Maritime Provinces were, I am informed, members of the Liberal party. I do not know any of them personally except Mr. Crowe. Mr. Walter Crowe has been one of the strongest standard bearers of the Liberal party in the county of Cape Breton for the past twenty-five years, and I have not a word to say against him. He is a member of my own profession. I have known him for many years, and, so far as I am aware, he is a capable and honourable man; but certainly he was not selected by reason of his political opinions, because he has been one of the strongest opponents of the Conservative party in this country ever since I have known him.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am satisfied that he was appointed on account of his being an officer in command of the Field Battery at Sydney.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed that he had been an officer in days gone by, but that he had retired.

Mr. MACDONALD: It was in his military capacity solely that he had to do with horses.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He had ceased to have any connection with military affairs. How valuable military knowledge may be in the purchase of horses, I do not know. In Great Britain strong criticism has been made of the selection of only military men for the purpose, it being alleged that they have not the knowledge and experience to discharge that duty as efficiently as it might be discharged by others.

In justice to Mr. Foster, I should give the prices paid by the respective purchasing agents. The horses purchased by Mr. L. B. Anderson in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island cost this country on an average $225.70; the horses purchased by Mr. Crowe and Mr. E. C. Thurston averaged $187.50; the horses purchased by Mr. H. B. McLeod and Mr. E. C. Thurston averaged $186.64; and the horses purchased by Mr. Foster and those who were associated with him cost on an average $170.54. It is but fair to Mr. Foster that this fact should be made plain to Parliament and to the people. The Public Accounts Committee have made a special report upon the transaction which I now place before the House:

> Your committee have had under consideration the purchase of horses for the Militia Department in the province of Nova Scotia, and beg to report to the House the evidence and documents in connection therewith.
>
> Your committee are of the opinion that the evidence respecting the purchase of horses in Nova Scotia discloses circumstances of such an unsatisfactory character that further investigation and action are necessary, and they recommend that the said evidence and all documents connected with the matters aforesaid be referred to the Department of Justice with instructions to make such investigations, to institute such prosecutions and to take such proceedings as may be found necessary to protect the public interest.
>
> And your committee recommends that a further investigation should be made by the Government in regard to any irregularities which may have taken place in any other province of Canada, where such steps will be authorized and warranted by evidence or information of credible persons.

As far as Mr. Foster's appointment is concerned, apart altogether from any comment upon the manner in which he discharged his duties, Colonel Neill never should have appointed him and Mr. Foster never should have accepted the appoint- no hesitation in saying that, if Colonel Neill was not aware that Mr. Foster was a member of Parliament. I do not know about that. Colonel Neill is at the front and his evidence could not be obtained, but I have no hesitation in saying that, if Colonel Neill did know that Mr. Foster was a member of Parliament and appointed him to discharge the duties of a purchasing agent, he showed no such discretion as I would expect from an officer of his position and experience. It follows necessarily from this, that it was most unfortunate and regrettable that Mr. Foster should have accepted any such duties; it was a most

regrettable occurrence. Upon that I shall make some observations later.

But having undertaken to discharge the duties of a purchasing agent for the Government and the people of this country, it devolved upon a member of Parliament above all other men, if you can imagine him undertaking such duties, to see that the most careful and most scrupulous account was kept of every dollar of the public money entrusted to him. I regret to say that the evidence—Mr. Foster's own evidence—convinces me that he did not have such proper regard to that imperative duty as his position demanded. We are confronted with the extraordinary situation that the Government, having placed $73,000 in the hands of Mr. Foster and a veterinary surgeon, have up to the present time had really no accounting for the money so entrusted to them. It may be perfectly true, as has been represented by gentlemen to me on Mr. Foster's behalf, that in the ordinary course of business where men are sent forth to buy horses, cattle, or other animals, the mere production of the animal is in itself a sufficient receipt; but I venture to believe that all the members of the House will agree with me that no such course of procedure as that can for one moment be tolerated in connection with the public affairs of this country. No vouchers are produced, and there seems to have been very little effort on the part of the persons concerned to have them produced. The matter, even after it had come before the Public Accounts Committee, seemed to have been treated in the most casual and extraordinary manner by the persons chiefly concerned.

Evidence has been given of some fraud or imposition practised upon the Government in connection with this matter by certain persons who sold horses to the Government. Some of the most disgraceful and cynical passages that were ever uttered in the presence of the Public Accounts Committee have been testified to on oath by certain men brought before that committee as witnesses in this matter—men who did not hesitate to declare upon their oath that they were defrauding the Government; that they knew they were defrauding the Government, and rejoiced in the opportunity to do so. So far as these men are concerned, I make this statement: first, if the laws of this country permit the courts of justice to enforce restitution against them, that restitution will be enforced; secondly, that if those laws permit the walls of the penitentiary to encircle them, they will go there.

What is the duty of the Government? The duty of the Government is to make the fullest and most determined investigation into the whole matter. The duty of the Government is to see that there is a proper accounting, by all persons concerned, for the sum of $73,000 of the public money of Canada; and the duty of the Government will not stop there. Horses purchased elsewhere in the province of Nova Scotia and in New Brunswick, and possibly in other parts of Canada, seem to have been purchased at a higher price

12 noon

than those with which we are concerned at this moment. We shall make inquiry into these matters, wherever it appears to us that there is any reasonable justification or cause for that inquiry.

I have spoken of what took place in connection with the furnishing of horses for the first contingent. Those horses were provided and purchased under great stress and in great urgency. I might fairly refer, I think, to the fact that after the stress and urgency had passed away, we appointed a man whose character, ability and position are above question, Sir Adam Beck, to purchase horses in all the provinces of Canada east of the Great Lakes. In the western provinces my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major General Hughes) appointed a man whom I do not know as I know Sir Adam Beck, but who, as I understand from the best information available, has thoroughly safeguarded the public interest in western Canada as Sir Adam Beck has certainly safeguarded the public interest in eastern Canada.

Let me call it to your attention that during the past eight months the Government have purchased nearly 20,000 horses in Canada, that about 8,000 of them were purchased during the early weeks of stress and urgency; so that, notwithstanding all that has been said and the clamour that has been raised, and without minimizing in the slightest degree our responsibility to probe the whole matter to the bottom, it does seem to me that very little has been brought forth during the six weeks' investigation by this committee.

A further resolution is before the House, moved in the committee by a Conservative member, the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), in the following terms:

In view of the evidence adduced during the course of their inquiry into the matters referred

by the House to them, your committee desire to draw the attention of the House to the requirement for the inauguration of a system of purchase, inspection and audit that will adequately protect the country from irregularities and frauds.

With any movement for a better system of purchase, inspection and audit as far as it can be devised, I am thoroughly in sympathy, and I will have something to say in regard to that before I conclude my remarks. With respect to the enactment of legislation for this purpose, may I say to my hon. friend from Kingston, to all the members of this House and to the people of this country, that there never has been any such legislation devised and there never can be any such legislation devised as will absolutely prevent fraud so long as there are dishonest people in the world.

The only thing that will accomplish this is raising the standard of public opinion and having conduct such as this made so absolutely abhorrent to the public sense of the country that it will eventually drive it out. But, in so far as legislation may aid I am perfectly prepared to bring down to Parliament any legislation that may be recommended. As soon as this resolution was passed, it was brought to my attention; and I sent immediately for my colleague, the Minister of Finance, and asked him to convene the deputy minister of his department, the Auditor General, and the deputy minister of Militia and Defence, as that department has chiefly been under consideration, and to ascertain from them, and especially from the Auditor General himself, whether any further legislation was required and should be adopted at this session. If any further legislation appeared necessary or even desirable, I for my part was willing to forward it and expedite it and endeavour to have it passed.

With regard to the whole question of purchases by the Government since the war broke out and the danger of fraud being practised upon the Government under conditions of urgency which have not absolutely disappeared as yet, I will in a moment make a statement of some importance; but in the meantime it is desirable, in view of the exaggeration which has prevailed respecting the matter, to point out this: the committee on Public Accounts has for six weeks or more been engaged in investigating an expenditure of $50,000,000 for war purposes. I have made it absolutely clear to the House and to the country that we have imposed no limit upon that investigation more than that my colleagues and all the Conservative members upon this committee, have themselves insisted upon investigation to the fullest possible extent. What I am about to say is not to be understood as minimizing the importance of the loss of a single dollar to the public treasury, because not one dollar ought to be lost; but I think it is worth while to point out that after a most searching inquiry and investigation for six weeks, conducted in a spirit which certainly did not desire to hide anything that could be brought out to the discredit of the Government and its administration, the total net result is that in respect of the Powell contract $6,300 are to be shown overpaid; that in respect of the binoculars, I would estimate the amount overpaid at $3,000 at the outside—I am taking 166 binoculars and allowing, roughly speaking, $20 overpaid in respect of each pair—and that in respect of the horses, so far as I can gather from the evidence, nothing has been shown up to the present time to indicate that more than a like amount, that is $3,000, has been lost to the country if even that amount has been lost. So that at the outside there is a total net result of $12,000 out of $50,000,000 or one-fortieth of one per cent. Of that amount the sum of $6,300 has already been recovered, leaving less than $6,000, or less than one eightieth of one per cent of an expenditure of $50,000,000, as the sum in respect of which all this clamour has been raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) the other day, at the conclusion of a very eloquent speech, asked us to turn away from the horrors of the Public Accounts Committee. Might I ask him to turn his gaze upon the inferno of the Ferguson report?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Might I interrupt my right hon. friend to the extent of saying that I asked that the soldiers' gaze might be turned away from the horrors of the Public Accounts Committee; and I would like also, if his courtesy will extend that far, to keep the soldiers' gaze away, equally naturally and logically from the Ferguson report, on the broadest public grounds.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I can sympathize with my hon. friend in his latter aspiration, particularly if the soldiers should be permitted to exercise their franchise.

Early in the course of the war I discussed the subject of purchases, naturally in the first instance with the Minister of Militia;

I discussed it also with the Minister of Naval Affairs, with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and with other members of the Government who might be brought in one way or other more or less closely in touch with the purchase of supplies or materials out of the appropriation of $50,000,000 which was made at the August session of Parliament. We laid down the doctrine which has been followed as I understand, by the Minister of Militia, except in very exceptional cases, and for good cause, which has also been followed by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce and by other members of the Government who have had to do with these purchases. The principle which we laid down and maintained was this: that we should purchase from the manufacturer or producer direct, and should avoid the services of middlemen and the increased cost to the country that would result from their services. I am speaking in the presence of my colleagues, who know how often this subject has been discussed between us, and who thoroughly understand the principle which the Government as a whole, and the Minister of Militia and the Committee of Council, have adhered to from first to last in this matter. After acting for a few weeks as Minister of Militia during the absence of my hon. friend (General Hughes) in September and October last, I wrote to him immediately on his return from Great Britain, as follows:

Ottawa, November 18, 1914.

Dear General Hughes,—When acting as Minister of Militia during your absence at Valcartier I instructed Colonel Fiset, Deputy Minister, that the use of outside agents and middlemen should be avoided and that contracts should be made directly with manufacturers so that any unnecessary commissions or increased prices might be avoided. This is undoubtedly the wise policy and is entirely in accordance with the principles laid down by our party during the years past. If for any good reason you may think it desirable in the public interest that a different course should be pursued in any particular instance by reason of conditions arising out of the war I hope that you will first consult me as I consider the principle to be of prime importance.

Yours faithfully,
R. L. Borden.

Major General,
The Hon. Sam Hughes,
Minister of Militia,
Ottawa, Ont.

To this letter Major General Hughes replied:

Ottawa, November 21, 1914.

Personal.

Dear Sir Robert,—Re the avoidance of outside agents, and middlemen;

I heartily agree with your position and have pursued it everywhere it was possible. In fact, in no instance has it been departed from excepting in relation to the Ford motors, and I have been repeatedly informed by that company that no matter whether we ordered one motor, or one thousand motors, they would not make any difference in price. However, I notified them, some time since, that they must recognize us, not as individuals, but as a Government. They have now, offered to the department, free, one motor, fitted up as an ambulance, and I hope we will get them down to their proper position.

Regarding motor trucks, as you are aware, everything had to be done on the jump for the first contingent. For this contingent, we have appointed a committee to go into the whole matter.

I instructed them not only not to recognize any middleman but to refuse to recognize what they call their "Canadian Agency," that is an agency desirous of holding back ten or fifteen per cent in some cases for their Canadian agents. I have had them notified that these are not for use in Canada, therefore no Canadian, merely as a middleman, is entitled to any consideration.

I may say that while in new York I secured the services of Major Owen Thomas, an English expert mechanical engineer, and he has been largely instrumental in showing us how to bring down prices to rock bottom. I am having other inquiries made and hope, in a few days, to be able to give you a rock-bottom report.

And now just a word on the purchasing, contracting and general business dealing of all our departments. Since my advent here I have, in the early days, watched my director of contracts with very much concern, and also his assistants. At the end of a very few months I was absolutely convinced that not only was he strictly honest and honourable, but he was as fair and judicious, in the interests of the people of Canada, as it is possible for a man to be. I have, therefore placed implicit confidence in him, but have not relaxed in the slightest in my personal supervision.

Faithfully,
Sam Hughes.

Last autumn certain matters were brought to the attention of the Government which I deemed to be of grave concern. It was alleged that fraud or imposition had been practised upon the Government in the transactions mentioned; and it is only right that I should inform the House and the country as to the action we took in regard to them. The Minister of Customs (Mr. J. D. Reid) came to me in October, and told me that certain rumours were afloat as to one man in particular who had declared to his employers that he had been forced to pay $500 as a political contribution in order that he might obtain an order from the Department of Militia and Defence. I wrote two letters on the day on which that came to my attention, one to the Minister of Customs and the other to the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen). I will read these letters:

Ottawa, October 19, 1914.

Dear Dr. Reid,—In view of your statement to me as to representations made by Messrs. J. D. King and Company, of Toronto, the following course should be taken. As I understand it Messrs J. D. King and Company allege that in their endeavour to secure orders from the Department of Militia for shoes their representative, Mr. Acton, was forced to pay five hundred dollars and that it was represented to him that this contribution was for political purposes. According to information placed before me there is clear evidence of an intent to defraud the Government.

My attention has also been called by you to like allegations made by two other companies who desired to supply shoes to that department. You should communicate immediately with the Hon. Arthur Meighen, Solicitor General, and with Colonel Sherwood, commissioner of Dominion police, and the whole matter must be thoroughly investigated. I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Meighen with the further instructions that any persons concerned in any such attempt are to be prosecuted to the utmost limit of the law.

Yours faithfully,
R. L. Borden.

On the same day I wrote to Mr. Meighen this letter:

Ottawa, October 19, 1914.

Dear Mr. Meighen,—The enclosed copy of a letter to the Hon. J. D. Reid explains itself. I desire that you make a thorough investigation of the apparent attempts to defraud the Government which have been disclosed to him. For this purpose you will obtain such assistance as may be necessary from Colonel Sherwood, commissioner of the Dominion police. The Minister of Justice should be consulted whenever you may think it necessary. You have my authority and direction to prosecute to the utmost limit of the law all persons who appear upon reasonable information to have been concerned in such attempt.

Yours faithfully,
R. L. Borden.

I was afterwards informed by Mr. Meighen that upon investigation—and if I am not stating these facts correctly, I hope the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) will correct me—the person who had represented this payment to have been made for political purposes had really put his employer's money into his own pockets. When we ascertained these facts a warrant was sworn out against him, and he fled the country and has not since been heard from. Subsequently other matters were brought to my attention, and I wrote to Mr. Meighen exactly the same kind of letter, telling him, in addition, that in his endeavour to get at the bottom of such attempts to defraud the Government, he was to use all the powers of the law, employing the Chief of the Dominion Police and all the staff under his command, and to spare no expense for that purpose.

So far as these matters, or any other such matters, are concerned, what we propose to do in every instance is this—to investigate every suspicious case, and to exact restitution and punishment so far as the laws of this country will permit.

And let me say now, for the benefit of Parliament, and particularly for the information of persons throughout this country who may be concerned in selling supplies or materials to the Government, that if any man in Canada, be he Conservative or Liberal, proposes to commit any fraud or imposition upon the Government and people of this country, or to be concerned in any attempt for that purpose, especially in connection with the war vote, he should remember that there are courts of justice in this country, and that the doors of the penitentiary are yawning for every man who commits such an offence.

Now, in connection with supplies generally we have had under consideration more than once during the past two years a proposal to establish a general purchasing commission for all departments of this Government. I myself have discussed it with my colleagues, and I know that my colleagues have discussed it with the officers of their departments. No doubt hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who were ministers and heads of departments know how difficult it is to get officials to agree that any such proposal is practicable or possible. Objections of one kind and another have been made, and nothing in that regard has been accomplished up to the present time, chiefly, if not altogether, for this reason; also owing to the fact that since we came into power the sessions have been long and very arduous, and that during the past eight months the conditions of urgency have been such that it was absolutely impossible to take up that general question in any effective way. The Department of Militia and Defence was, of course, never organized for the enormous work that is cast upon it at the present time. I have seen the officers of that department, especially the director of contracts, in a state of mental and physical exhaustion that was really pitiful, because of the tremendous amount of work imposed upon them. I have brought the director of contracts into my own office and asked him whether it would not be possible now, even under the stress of this war, so to reorganize his department as to safeguard the health of the men who are working there sometimes eighteen hours a day, Sundays included; and also more adequately to protect the public interest. But the difficulty has been that these men are absolutely submerged by the stress of work which is im-

posed upon them, and have no opportunity to reorganize their department. So it has gone on, and they have had imposed upon them not only the additional work caused by the furnishing of the supplies necessary for the Canadian expeditionary forces, but also the necessity of dealing with enormous contracts which the British, French and Russian Governments desire to place in this country, the inspection and arranging and handling of which cannot be done very effectively except through the officers of the Department of Militia and Defence.

One can readily understand that persons may desire from time to time to practise fraud or to impose exorbitant prices upon the Government through the very conditions which have arisen. I do not speak of that in a general sense, because I think that there are few people in Canada who would be guilty of anything so dishonest and unpatriotic. But we know that there are men who, even in time of war, will seek to make undue profits out of their business relations with the Government, even when all the people of the country are straining every effort and are inspired with the most patriotic desire to assist, and to sacrifice their own interests for that purpose. Let me point out to the House and to the country that this is not true of Canada alone; it is true of all other countries as well. It is true wherever human nature is what it has been in the past and what it is likely to be in the future. I have before me an article which appeared in the London Times on March 23 last. It is given a very prominent place in that great journal; it occupies two columns, and I may be pardoned if I read a brief extract from it:

> Is it not true to say that there is a most urgent call at the present time for satisfactory assurance that the money which is voted and the money which is given cannot flow too freely into the pockets of unscrupulous profit-seekers? It is the most natural and inevitable consequence of a system of "pay whatever has to be paid" and "have it done at once no matter what the cost" that excessive profit will be taken by some. There is no need to cite cases to prove that the evil exists, for no one doubts it; the disclosures which followed our last war are foundation enough for the general impressions which prevail in the minds of the people, and for suspicion which, perhaps, goes beyond what the facts warrant. The direct economic disadvantage is a serious matter, but the indirect results are of far more vital importance at the present time. It is not too much to say that this evil and the widespread suspicion it creates constitute a malignant growth which checks the free flow of blood to the nerve centres of our national effort.

It is desirable that I should state to the House the proposals of the Government as to further necessary safeguards in the expenditure of the appropriation of $100,000,000 which has been made by Parliament. I recognize at once that it is the duty of the Government, in view of the character of that vote and of the wide discretion thus conferred upon the Government, to see that the utmost possible care is exercised and that every possible precaution is taken in order that not one dollar of this large amount shall be expended otherwise than wisely and economically.

But before I come to a statement of the measures which the Government propose to take for that purpose, I have another duty to perform which is of a painful character. It is one which, nevertheless, must be discharged, however disagreeable it may be. It is one of the penalties of occupying a prominent position in public life that a man may be called upon to perform duties which his every instinct, so far as his personal feelings are concerned, would shrink from. In connection with the two members of Parliament to whom I have already alluded in relation to their connection with these matters. I think it is my duty to say a few words. I sent for Mr. A. De Witt Foster and asked him as to his connection with this matter, and why it was that he permitted himself to act as purchasing agent for the Government of this country. It is only fair that I should give to the House his side of the story, although I am bound to say that it was not satisfactory to me. He said that the county of Kings, N.S., which he represents in this Parliament, largely depends upon the apple crop; that there was no market for apples last autumn and that the people thought there might be some distress; that a great many persons in that county and elsewhere in Nova Scotia had horses which they might sell and that his constituents considered it unfair that horses should be purchased in other parts of the country where conditions were more fortunate than in the Annapolis valley and elsewhere in Nova Scotia, and that they should not be purchased in that province He said that he went to Col. Neill, the principal veterinary officer, and told him of this, and that Col. Neill informed him that the horses were being provided elsewhere, that no horses could be purchased at that time in the maritime provinces;

that the matter was very urgent; that horses had to be procured at once; that arrangements had to be made elsewhere and they had been made elsewhere; and that was an end of it. On the following day, Colonel Neill telephoned him that some 600 horses were not forthcoming under the arrangements previously made, and that he would be very glad to have them purchased in the Lower Provinces; and he asked whether Mr. Foster would see that they were purchased with the least possible delay, and that the matter was urgent and it had to be done at once. Mr. Foster says he embodied the substance of that conversation in a letter which he addressed to Colonel Neill and the next day he accepted the duties and proceeded to discharge them. So far as Mr. Foster's connection with the matter is concerned, it should be taken into consideration that he is a very young man, altogether inexperienced in business, and that he is not shown to have profited in any way by the transaction. But I am bound to say that his explanation to me of his undertaking the duty and his explanation—if it could be called an explanation—of his failure to supervise in the most careful manner the expenditure of that money and to bring back to the Government an exact account, with vouchers, of every dollar that had been expended, must be regarded as far from satisfactory.

As far as the member for Carleton (Mr. Garland) is concerned, I have already alluded to the purchases by Mr. Powell. Mr. Garland was formerly the owner of the business which is now carried on by the Carleton Drug Company, as I understand . The business was transferred to an incorporated company, and I think we may fairly assume, without doing any injustice to Mr. Garland, that he is the principal person interested and concerned in that company. He had in his employ this young man, who was devoting 12 or 14 hours a day to his duties and who received a salary of $75 a month. He not only permitted, but he encouraged and assisted that young man to make a contract with the Government under which, within a few weeks, he acquired a profit of $9,000. I cannot for one moment give my sanction or approval to a transaction of that character, because, to say the least, it is bound to arouse a very grave suspicion; and a member of Parliament, in respect of contracts with the Government, ought to keep himself absolutely above suspicion. Therefore, in respect of the hon. member for Carleton and in respect of the hon. member for Kings, N.S., I feel that I owe it as a duty to the Government of which I am the head, to the party of which, in federal affairs, I am the leader, and to this House and to this country, to express, as I do here express, my very grave disapproval of their conduct in respect of the matters which have been under investigation by the Public Accounts Committee.

I return to the question of what may be done by the Government to make it absolutely sure, that there shall be given to the people of this country every possible safeguard as to public expenditure. It is perfectly true that, so far as the investigation of the Public Accounts Committee is concerned, nothing has been disclosed—so far as I am aware and I speak subject to correction—in respect of transactions other than those which occurred during the first six or eight weeks of the war. But, nevertheless, I realize and I think all members of the Government realize, the Minister of Militia himself realizes, that that department was not organized to perform the enormous amount of work that is imposed upon it at present. What has been the course taken by the Mother Country under similar conditions? In respect of such matters, the course taken by the Government of the Mother Country has been to call to the aid of the Government the best business ability of the country. The business men of that country have responded and splendid results have been thus obtained. The Minister of Militia himself, it is only just to say, at least two or three months ago brought this question before Council and urged upon Council the advisability of having his department assisted in this regard by a committee of three business men. In respect of some other matters, the Minister of Militia has taken a course along that line which has brought about most excellent results.

If the House will pardon me—my remarks have been extended beyond what I had at first contemplated—I wish to place before Parliament the record of what has been accomplished by the committee appointed in this country to fill orders which the British Government desired to place here, if they could be placed in Canada, for the supply of munitions. A committee was formed by the Minister of Militia in the early stages of the war, consisting at that time of Col. A. Bertram, Chairman ; Thos. Cantley, Esq.; Geo. W. Watts, Esq.; E. Carnegie, Esq., representing the manufacturers; Col. T. Benson, Master General of Ordnance,

Col. Greville Harston, Chief Inspector of Arms and Ammunition; and Lt.-Col. F. D. Lafferty, R.C.A., Superintendent of the Dominion Arsenal, representing the Department of Militia and Defence.

I have asked the chairman of that committee to prepare a report of their work for the purpose of showing what can be done by a business organization of this character, through the co-operation of business men in this country. A report has been prepared by Mr. E. Carnegie, who has had experience in work of this kind in the Mother Country. He was appointed Ordnance Adviser of this committee. Having met him, I desire to bear my testimony to his ability and efficiency, which I think are very great. Colonel Bertram and indeed all the members of the committee have brought great industry and zeal to the discharge of their duties. I would not care to read this memorandum, but if my right hon. friend would permit, I would like to have it included in Hansard as part of my speech. The report comprises a great deal more than can be made public. The tables and statistics which were attached to it I have necessarily omitted, because we would not even ask the War Office for permission to publish them. I have struck out a few words in one place and made a few eliminations of matters that I thought, in the public interest, ought not to be made public. But, subject to that, I would like to give the report to the House, and I think hon. members will find it is of interest. The report is as follows:

Report on the Formation and work of the Shell Committee by David Carnegie, M.I.C.E., Ordnance Adviser.

To Sir Robert Borden,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa, Ont.

Introduction.

Soon after the declaration of war, the hon. Minister of Militia, General Hughes, was asked by the British Government, if he would place contracts on their behalf, for arms and ammunition, with the United States.

After having arranged certain contracts there for small arms, etc., he received an inquiry for 200,000 schrapnel shells, empty, in equal numbers of eighteen and fifteen-pounders.

Knowing that it would take about eleven years to complete such a contract in the Dominion arsenal with their existing equipment, he conceived the idea of utilizing the engineering factories throughout the Dominion for shell manufacture and immediately set in motion forces to accomplish this object.

It was with some reluctance that the manufacturers, at the call of the minister, responded to his suggestion, even though at that time many of their factories were practically idle.

The remarkable ability shown by the various manufacturers in converting their machine tools rapidly, to produce shells of the highest quality, not only surprised the Minister of Militia and those instructed by him to direct the manufacture, but convinced him that this new industry could be extended to the manufacture of the complete filled and fixed ammunition, including the shells, brass cartridge cases, primers, clips, cordite, powder, pellets and fuses. As a matter of fact, within a phenomenally short period, all these different parts, excepting the fuses (which are about to be manufactured), are now being produced in Canada, giving labour to thousands of men in different parts of the Dominion who would have been otherwise out of employment.

Details of the committee's formation, constitution and operation are given in the following pages. Tabulated facts of the materials used in the contracts and their value are also recorded, together with note on the progress and nature of the work involved in the various contracts handled by the committee.

2.—Formation of the Committee.

Before actually forming the committee, the Minister of Militia asked Colonel Greville Harston and Lt.-Colonel F. D. Lafferty, to get in touch with all manufacturers in Canada, who they thought could make the component parts for shrapnel shells. He particularly emphasized his desire to have the steel manufactured in Canada.

As a result, the following manufacturers were called to Ottawa to meet General Hughes, on the 2nd of September, 1914:

Col. A. Bertram, of Messrs. J. Bertram Son & Co., Dundas, Ontario; Geo. W. Watts, Esq., of the Can. Gen. Elec. Co., Toronto, Ontario; The Ingersoll Rand Drill Co., of Sherbrooke, Que.; Goldie, McCulloch Co., of Galt, Ont; E. Carnegie, Esq., of the Electric Steel & Metals Company, Ltd., Welland, Ont.

At a meeting of the above, the whole question was fully discussed. Lt.-Col. Lafferty described in detail the manufacture of the shells and their component parts, and Col. Greville Harston dealt with the system of inspection. Drawings and specifications were shown and explained, after which the meeting assured the minister that the work could be done in Canada.

On the 8th of September, 1914, at a meeting held by the minister at the Dominion Arsenal, the following committee was appointed to organize the work throughout the Dominion:

Colonel A. Bertram, Chairman; Thos. Cantley, Esq., Geo. W. Watts, Esq., E. Carnegie, Esq., representing the manufacturers; Colonel T. Benson, Master General of Ordnance; Colonel Greville Harston, C. I. Arms and Ammunition; Lt.-Col. F. D. Lafferty, R.C.A., Superintendent of the Dominion Arsenal, representing the Department of Militia and Defence.

Lt.-Colonel Lafferty undertook the technical instruction of the manufacturers in shell construction, and it was decided that the examination and inspection would be carried out by the chief inspector of arms and ammunition.

About two weeks after the organization of the committee, Mr. David Carnegie, of London, Eng., was appointed by the minister as ordnance adviser to the shell committee.

When it is recalled that at the time in question, the Minister of Militia was engaged in the colossal task of raising, training and equipping a contingent of Canadians for the "front," it is remarkable that he should have found time to think of the many factories throughout the Dominion which were idle and to devise such an efficient means of helping them and the British War Office. It is somewhat flattering to find that the British Government has recently followed similar plans for utilizing the manufacturers throughout England for the manufacture of shells.

The minister in selecting manufacturers to work with officers of his own department, combined the commercial and technical ability requisite and the results of his choice have proved already eminently successful.

To Colonel Bertram belongs the praise for the harmonious and efficient work of the committee.

3.—Work of the Committee.

The work of the committee in the early stages, was that of formulating definite plans of procedure. They determined that, as far as possible, all the materials employed in the shells would be made in Canada; up to that time, for instance, no Canadian steel had been used for the production of ammunition.

To Colonel Cantley the committee is under obligation for having rapidly installed and equipped plant for producing the first steel made in Canada for shell manufacture.

With the exception of the copper bands all parts of the shells now produced are made in Canada, and it is hoped that, before long, these also will be included amongst the Canadian industries.

Another important decision made by the committee was to supply to the shell assembling manufacturers, all the component parts of shells, free of charge. By this means many of the smaller manufacturers have been relieved of the financial strain of carrying a heavy stock of raw materials.

It was also decided that uniform prices would be paid for the same articles, thus eliminating unhealthy competition with its risks of faulty workmanship.

Perhaps an equally important decision was the appointment of an inspection company to deal with all shell components; this has taken the entire responsibility of inspection from the shell assembling manufacturers and has also given the shell committee the opportunity of satisfying themselves beyond any doubt that the component parts of shells are correct before the finished shell passes into the hands of the Government inspector.

Many other minor details regarding insurance, shipping, financing, etc., were decided, which have proved to be of great help in carrying on the work of the committee.

4.—Executive Work.

The executive work of the committee has been very wisely entrusted to the chairman, Colonel Bertram, who reports weekly to the Minister of Militia and also to the committee when it meets (which is usually monthly) or more often, at the call of the minister .

The work consists of controlling what might be regarded as a huge combination of factories, in which various contracts are being executed to British War Office specifications, which entails constant attention and queries regarding the selection of suitable factories, the placing of contracts, instructing manufacturers in the art, inspecting the parts made, and the payment and auditing of accounts, etc.

Before contracts are placed, the ability of the firm to carry out the work is fully investigated. If there is any question as to their plant being unsuitable, a competent inspector is sent to report upon the state of the factory.

To safeguard the interests of the committee and to insure the work being carried out in accordance to promise, contracts are placed subject to cancellation, if not carried out promptly.

Each manufacturer is supplied with a set of inspection gauges as a guide in making the manufacturing gauges required. They are kept to check the working gauges and are the property of the committee.

The preparation of drawings of the gauges for the various component parts of the different shells manufactured and the preparation of gauges and their distribution and use involve a considerable amount of labour.

The inspection of the various component parts, including the analyses of material, various physical tests calling for the employment of over 146 inspectors, besides four chief inspectors, show in some measure the nature and extent of this part of the work. Most of the inspectors employed are experienced machinists and tool makers who can be trusted to carry out the work thoroughly.

The final inspection of the finished shell is carried out by an army of nearly 200 examiners and district inspectors, under the direction of the chief inspector of arms and ammunition.

On receipt of a certificate that the shells have passed examination and have been packed ready for shipment, payment is made to the manufacturer.

A chartered accountant recommended by the general manager of the Bank of Montreal, checks the accounts of the committee every month. These are then forwarded to Mr. J. W. Borden, chief accountant for the Militia Department. It might be said in passing that the committee's accountant has expressed himself in gratifying terms of the highly efficient way in which the accounts of the committee are kept.

5.—Shell Contracts.

When it became generally known that shells were being manufactured successfully, the demands for contracts from all classes of manufacturers were very numerous, and it became necessary to inspect the factories to decide which were suitable for undertaking the work. Visits were made to them and it was found that a large number of additional factories could be usefully employed.

The ordnance advisor reported this matter and indicated how many more shells could be undertaken. The Minister of Militia called a meeting of the committee at Ottawa and, after discussing the matter, cabled to Lord Kitchner, pointing out that much larger contracts could be undertaken by the manufacturers in Canada. He emphasized the fact that many works were standing idle in the Dominion, while contracts were being placed in the United States for shells by the British War Office. This resulted in additional contracts for 18-pr. fixed ammunition, complete without fuses and empty 18-pr. shrapnel shells.

It was proposed by several of the manufacturers that a deputation from the committee should be sent to the War Office, London, to put their claims before the Secretary of State for War. The Minister of Militia decided, on the recommendation of the committee, to send Mr. David Carnegie, as he was familiar with the whole situation. It was also decided that he should visit Woolwich Arsenal and obtain the latest information on the various details in the manufacture of complete ammunition.

The result of his visit has been fully reported to the Minister of Militia, but it might be briefly stated here that the War Office officials did not fully understand the nature and importance of the committee's work, and had no idea that the factories in Canada were capable of undertaking such contracts, until these facts were placed before them.

Mr. Carnegie presented to the Master General of the Ordnance, General Sir Von-Donop, K.C.B. one of the first shrapnel shells made entirely of Canadian materials, excepting the copper band. He also informed the various officials at the War Office that it was the intention of the Minister of Militia and his committee, to make ultimately the copper bands in Canada. As a result of this visit, several additional large contracts have been placed with the committee.

The only material not made in Canada is copper, which, however, is mined and smelted in the Dominion and subsequently sent to the United States for refining.

Miscellaneous.

In addition to the foregoing, the Minister of Militia, through his committee, has made several investigations for the War Office in connection with the supply of propellants and high explosives. An investigation was undertaken regarding the supply of Nitro-cellulose powder by a large firm in the United States. Other matters have been investigated, such as the supply of rifles and ammunition for the Russian Government.

The Manufacture of Tri-Nitro-Toluene.

In addition to the manufacture of several thousand tons of cordite and powder in connection with the present contracts for shells, the Minister of Militia has been instrumental in initiating a new industry in Canada, viz: the utilization of the by-products from the coke ovens of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, at Sydney, N.S., for the manufacture of the high explosive, Tri-nitro-toluene. The revenue alone from the contract placed with this company will be nearly three million dollars; but the value of having such an industry in Canada far outweighs any money value which can be named.

In conclusion, it is gratifying to relate that the quality and finish of the shells, cases, etc., made in the Dominion, are equal to, if not better than the British shells.

(Sgd.) The Shell Committee,
Alex. Bertram,
Chairman.

It must certainly be conceded that the results thus obtained by the formation of this committee are most gratifying.

What do we propose to do? We propose, as soon as this Parliament prorogues, to take up the question of the purchase of supplies under the appropriation of $100,000,000, and we propose to have a commission appointed of either one man or three men—I have not yet decided whether it would be better to have one or three—to deal with the whole question. If we select one man, we shall endeavour to get the best available business man in Canada for the purpose. If we select three men, the same qualifications will be required of them. We will get the very best that are available. We will select those men without regard to any consideration at all except to employ men of the ripest experience, the highest ability and most perfect integrity. Having selected that one man or those three men, we shall confide to them the whole direction and control of all supplies which are to be purchased under the appropriation of $100,000,000.

We believe that in that way we shall be able to safeguard most thoroughly and effectively the public interests of this country. We realize that the country is doing and has done its duty in the splendid response which is being made to the call for men, and in the magnificent patriotic fund which has been collected from all parts of the country for the purpose of providing for their dependents. We realize that the response to the call to arms is all the more impressive and important because it has been given freely and voluntarily. Parliament has also done its duty in giving to the Government a vote of $100,000,000 for carrying on the war. It remains for the Government of the country to do its duty; that is, to take such means and to employ such safeguards as will result in the wise and economical and efficient expenditure of that sum of $100,000,000, to the end that not one single dollar of it shall be lost or wasted, so that we may be enabled at another session of Parliament to give an account of our stewardship which shall commend itself not only to the members of this Parliament, but to the people of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The House is called upon to approve three reports of the Committee on Public Accounts—the fourth, the sixth and the seventh. The fourth deals with binoculars and the sixth with horses; and these can be passed over without any more remarks at the present time. But I attach, and the House will attach, great importance to the seventh report, which is in these words:

In view of the evidence adduced during the course of their inquiry into the matters re-

ferred by the House to them, your committee desire to draw the attention of the House to the requirement for the inauguration of a system of purchase, inspection and audit that will adequately protect the country from irregularities and frauds.

I do not in any way begrudge the time that has been taken by the Prime Minister in dealing with these matters, for they are of great importance; but I am sorry to say that in view of the short time we are away from prorogation I must very materially curtail the remarks I had to make.

Perhaps I may be permitted to express my regret that in a matter of this kind my right hon. friend thought fit to resort again to the old tu quoque argument, and tried to create the impression, in fact be made the assertion, that the late Administration did not favour public investigations, but rather curtailed or prevented them wherever they could. In that part of his speech my right hon. friend cited two instances: one was a general proposition of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), which was vague in terms and to no particular purpose, and which simply laid down a rule of conduct; the other was an exception taken in the Committee of Public Accounts in the year 1906 by the then Minister of Justice and the then Minister of Finance to a question which was put to a witness. That witness was asked to divulge certain matters of his own private business. To that question he took exception and the chairman then ordered him to answer; and on the exception being pressed the Minister of Justice and the Finance Minister of that day both thought that the witness should not be bound to divulge his own business secrets. It is impossible at this moment to review the whole case in connection with that, but, so far as I remember, the attitude which was taken by the then Minister of Justice and the then Minister of Finance was not at the time challenged in this House. In view of that fact, and in view of the character of the gentlemen who made the objection, I think my right hon. friend would have done better not to mention the matter at all. I have not the matter very fresh in my mind, but I think the Minister of Justice of that day must have been either Mr. Fitzpatrick, now Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, Chief Justice, or Mr. Aylesworth, now Sir Allen Aylesworth; I believe it was Mr. Aylesworth. Now, I appeal to the hon. members of this House who have known Mr. Aylesworth of the past, and Sir Allen Aylesworth of to-day, and who know of his character and ability as a jurist, whether an opinion of his should be lightly questioned. In the long list of those who have been incumbents of the position of Minister of Justice, from Sir John A. Macdonald's time down to the present day, I think I can fairly say that Sir Allen Aylesworth occupies a most eminent position. His ability as a jurist was never challenged, nor was his honour as a man ever questioned; and when he and Mr. Fielding, a man also of the strictest integrity, give their views on such a point, I repeat that it was not well advised on the part of my right hon. friend to bring their judgment into question six, or seven, or eight years after the event. This, however, is of little consequence. But if I were prepared to follow the matter a step further, I would remind the House that the late Administration did not hesitate to appoint, on mere newspaper rumours, a special committee, and to have the fullest possible investigation of all matters connected with the Transcontinental railway. But, Sir, it serves no good purpose to recriminate in order to justify oneself. Let us look rather to the business with which we have to deal.

Through a motion made by a gentleman on this side of the House, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), the Public Accounts Committee was seized of questions which were not merely attracting but engrossing the public attention, and which it would have been criminal not to investigate at once, in order to satisfy the public mind. Impelled by the uneasiness in the public mind, and by that sense of duty which characterizes him, the junior member for Halifax asked the House to have these matters referred to the Public Accounts Committee, and since that time that committee has been investigating different matters. My right hon. friend says that very few losses to the country have been found: some $3,000 upon binoculars, and some thousands of dollars upon horses. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the Public Accounts Committee have been simply scratching the surface, and though they have been able to make only a very incomplete report, it is nevertheless of the most disturbing character.

My right hon. friend has referred at some length to the committee's report upon drugs. The only thing I have to say upon that matter is that it is evident, and it should have been evident to the department from the first, that the man who was dealing with the Government in drugs was not Mr. Powell, but his employer, who was to profit by the transaction. No man of com-

mon sense will believe that a junior clerk earning $75 a month could have entered into a contract of such magnitude as this. The matter is no longer in issue between us. The member of the House who tried to shield himself behind Mr. Powell did not profit much by that, but the fact is there. If any blame is to be attached to anybody, the Department of Militia and Defence was certainly remiss in not exercising its judgment and seeing that it was not the clerk, Powell, they were dealing with, but another man.

In that connection my right hon. friend has paid a high tribute to the officers of the Department of Militia and Defence. I have not a word to say against them; on the contrary, I endorse absolutely every word he says as to the high character of the staff of that Department. In respect of one of the officers, General Jones, I endorse every word that was said by my right hon. friend. The evidence of Mr. Shaver is of no account in this matter. Whether Mr. Shaver aspersed the character of General Jones or did not is of no consequence at all in connection with the question we have to investigate to-day; because, whether Mr. Shaver did or did not tell the truth, the fact remains that the department entered into a transaction with Powell which, on the face of it, was fraudulent. As to General Jones, I understand that his fellow-officers do not believe the aspersions upon his character, and I agree with them. General Jones is a gentleman of the highest character; he is a son of one of my oldest friends, and, being the son of his father, he could not be anything else than an honest and honourable man. But the simple fact remains that the Department of Militia exercised no judgment and no discretion in contracting with Powell. It must have known from the first that Powell was not the contractor, but that the real contractor was the man behind him.

At one o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Speaking of the purchase of horses, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister this morning stated that when the Government came into office they followed the system which they had found established by their predecessors. The system itself was right, but it so happened that the principal agent chosen for this important duty was not fit for the task entrusted to him. My right hon. friend stated that the Government were not responsible for the selection of Mr. A. De Witt Foster, the hon. member for the electoral district of Kings, N.S.; but they cannot escape their responsibility constitutionally; they are responsible before the public. They say they did not know of the selection of Mr. Foster, and I of course admit at once, since the Prime Minister has given us his word for it, that the Government did not at the time know of the appointment of Mr. Foster; but it is difficult to understand how Mr. Foster could go on purchasing and expending something like $73,000 without the Government knowing that he was spending this money. Seventy-three thousand dollars to buy horses is not spent in a day; such an expenditure must cover a period of some weeks if not months. The Government must have been in receipt daily, certainly weekly, of reports from Mr. Foster and his agents, which would show to them that this man, whom they had not selected, who they now believe was not fit for the task entrusted to him, and who, by all rules of propriety, should not have been entrusted with the task, was spending the money of the country from day to day, and yet no action seems to have been taken to put a stop to his usefulness or want of usefulness. The Prime Minister stated that Mr. Foster had not been as fortunate as he might have been in his selection of assistants. It so happened that Mr. Foster fell in with those members of the community who are to be found everywhere, the horse breeder and the horse trader. The horse trader in this case—and there were more than one—proceeded in the manner of David Harum, the model horse-trader: he did to Mr. Foster what David Harum did to all those with whom he came into contact; that is, he acted on the principle, "Do unto the other fellow as the other fellow would do unto you, but do it first." My right hon. friend was very indignant, and he told us in tones of thunder that if there was any law and justice in the land, the men who had so abused the confidence of Mr. Foster would find it hot for them and would be put into the penitentiary. If any one is to go to the penitentiary for these transactions, I do not think it probable that it will be the horse-trader who sold to Mr. Foster spavined horses and old mares that had been rejected as being too old at the time of the South African war. There is an old Latin saying: Caveat emptor—let the buyer beware. If the purchaser bought these spavined and old horses, then the fault is not so much upon

the man who did the selling as upon the man who accepted the animals.

Mr. J. D. REID: It was not sworn to that there was a horse purchased that had been refused at the time of the South African war as being too old.

Mr. McKENZIE: It was sworn to.

Mr. GAUVREAU: It is too late now to make denials.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is not worth while discussing whether the statement is true or not true; I believe it is beyond doubt; or at all events, we have been so informed. But when the Prime Minister this morning estimated the amount that the country has lost on account of horse purchases at $3,000, he was very short in his calculation, because if we take into account all the spavined horses and exhausted animals which were shot at Valcartier, I believe the loss of the country must run into thousands of dollars. Be this as it may, I do not think I should be very severe upon my right hon. friend on this account, because it is always hard for a man to have to speak as he did this morning. When he came to speak of Mr. Foster, he said that he was sorry that he had to speak harshly of that gentleman. It seems to me, therefore, that the condition with regard to the whole transaction is this: the seller will be sent to the penitentiary if he is to be sent anywhere at all, and the buyer will be sent to the desert like the scapegoat of old, laden with all the sins of Israel and of the party. It is manifest that there was a carnival of corruption and graft in the Department of Militia and Defence in regard to the purchase of horses, boots, drugs, bandages, motor-trucks, to speak of nothing else—that on all these things the country was defrauded. I do not pretend that this is absolutely a country of angels; I am prepared to say that there has been a great deal of graft and corruption in this country, but if graft and corruption are criminal at all times they are doubly criminal in war time. The men who defrauded the Government put all our troops in danger and our successful participation in the war also in danger, and for this there can be no excuse and no possible pardon.

Mr. J. D. REID: Might I interrupt the right hon. gentleman? Why did he not prosecute grafters at the time of the South African war, when there was far more graft?

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I was prepared for this coming back, because the tu quoque argument is the only argument with my hon. friends opposite. The people expected, when they put my hon. friends in office, that they had done away with fraud; that my hon. friends would live up to their professions, and that in these matters they would not do what they charged us with doing.

Mr. REID: We left your appointees in office.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Sit down; you will have your turn.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In regard to investigations by commissions of inquiry, they ought to be carried on in the light of day and not behind closed doors as some have been under this Government. I call the attention of the House to two commissions in particular; the Transcontinental Railway Commission and the commission of Mr. Ferguson, of which we heard yesterday, those investigations have been conducted behind closed doors. No opportunity was given to the men attacked in Mr. Ferguson's report to defend themselves. I complained of this yesterday, and to show my hon. friend the condition of things, I want to quote to the House a telegram received this morning from Mr. Cruise by the hon. member for Edmonton:

Winnipeg, Man., April 14, 1915.

Hon. Frank Oliver,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

Ferguson's report concerning me absolutely false in its two essentials. First, I was a bona fide homesteader and not a squatter; secondly, I had twenty-six horses besides my cattle, as my application for patent shows and as Ferguson knew when he made his report. Will go to Ottawa if necessary. Wire me Royal Alexandra.

R. Cruise.

I appeal again to the fairness of the men who sit on the other side of the House. Mr. Cruise is a respected member of this House. He has a good reputation in his own constituency and in that whole section of country in which he is well-known. He was attacked here yesterday in his absence, which is bad enough, but he was not called by the Commissioner to answer to the charges made against him. Is that fair play?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know the right hon. gentleman does not wish to be unfair. Mr. Cruise was called, and was also represented by counsel at the inquiry.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Was he examined on this point?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Cruise was examined. He claimed that this transaction was bona fide, and Mr. Ferguson reports that he so claimed, but finds against him.

Mr. ROCHE: Mr. Cruise swore that he had fifteen head of his own cattle and bought seven, giving his promissory note, to make up the twenty that were necessary. He said nothing about any more.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Did he not say that he had twenty-six horses?

Mr. ROCHE: No, there was not one of these horses on the land he was homesteading.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is what he says at all events. If he was examined, then I withdraw what I said. But I said it in support of my contention that these investigations should be held in public and everybody should have an opportunity of being heard. Does the Solicitor General deny the proposition that these investigations should be held in public? Is he prepared to say that men can have the justice to which they are entitled if such investigations are held in secret, as this was? Everybody who has an innate sense of justice must agree with me that an investigation that is not made in the open light of day is not a proper investigation nor one upon which we can place reliance. It is an axiom of British justice that no person shall be condemned unless he has had an opportunity of being heard. If Mr. Cruise was heard in this investigation there are others who were not heard, who had no opportunity of being heard, and who were equally condemned. If we are to have investigations which will purify public life, as I hope we shall, then I insist as a condition absolutely essential that these investigations shall take place with open doors, and that every man whose name is brought before the commission shall have an opportunity to give his own version. When this is done we shall have something like justice.

We have been told also that the Government is going to prosecute the offenders, and the resolution we are now considering states that restitution must be demanded from parties who are found in the wrong, and the Department of Justice is entrusted with this duty. I have this to say to the Solicitor General, who represents the Department of Justice on this occasion, that if in these prosecutions the Department of Justice shows no more diligence, no more justice and no more fair-play, than it has shown in the case of the land owners at Valcartier, who for the last six months have been claiming their money and have not got it, then the offenders will have a good chance to go scot free. Twice before, and now for the third time, I have called the attention of the Government to the claims of these land owners who in the months of August and September last were deprived of their property, being called upon to give way to the necessities of the occasion, but who up to this day have not received the money to which they are entitled. I first called attention to this matter in the latter part of February. I was then told by the Minister of Militia in the presence of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice that most of these cases had been settled and that those that had not been would be settled very soon. I received a letter on the 25th of March from Mr. Cannon of the firm of Taschereau, Roy, Cannon, Parent & Fitzpatrick, who represents a number of these settlers, including Frank McLaughlin, Hugh Bowles, Madame Veuve Conway, Thomas Thompson, Michael Woodlock and Joseph Griffith, and I received a letter the following day from a widow, Mrs. Richard Smith, and up to that date these people had not received their money. I quoted letters going back to the month of November showing that they had refused to take what was offered them and had asked that the Government should at once proceed in the Exchequer Court; and yet no relief has been granted.

Major General HUGHES: I understand that there is an understanding that this debate is to end with the speech of the leader of the Opposition. One would think that common decency—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Major General HUGHES—would demand that no controversial matters be introduced into his speech. The Prime Minister understood that no new matter was to be introduced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not know about common decency; I leave that to my hon. friend; but I do know something of common sense, and if we are not to talk of controversial matters, what is this debate for?

Major General HUGHES: There is an understanding that the debate closes with the speech of the right hon. gentleman, so that there is no chance to reply to him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Certainly, the debate ends with my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems to me that this is going a little outside the record. We are dealing with a report of the Public Accounts Committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am just pointing out that the report recommends that the prosecution of offenders should be referred to the Department of Justice, and I am stating in your presence, Mr. Speaker, and before this House of Commons, that if the Department shows no more diligence in prosecuting offenders than it has shown in paying the creditors of the Government, the offenders will have a chance of going scot free.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that I think the right hon. gentleman is within his rights, but to take up these cases which are not before the House, and which were not before the committee—

Some hon. MEMBERS: They were before the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not so understand it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: On the 26th of March I had the promise of the Prime Minister that court proceedings in these matters would be taken. I called the attention of the Prime Minister and of the House to the fact that these men could not go to court; if they could they would have done so long ago, but it is wholly in the hands of the Government to bring these matters to court. I had a telegram from Mr. Cannon yesterday saying that to his knowledge these men have not been paid nor have proceedings been taken. Is that so, or is it not so? I have no opportunity to speak except on this occasion, for the House is to close in a few minutes. I ask, not as a matter of courtesy but as a matter of justice to these men and women, that, if the Government will not pay their claims they should be at once submitted to the court. That was promised on the 26th of March, and it is now the 15th of April, and still no understanding with these people has been reached.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a matter that comes not under my department, but under the department of a minister who is out of the House at present. From what information I have, however, I believe that the summonses have been issued, but considering the time that it has been before the Department of Justice, the matter could not be in court yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have received the following telegram from Mr. Cannon:

> Telegram received. Kept in house through sickness since eight days. As far as I know, Valcartier clients have received neither money nor information.

As I have said, I must hurry, because time is precious. I wish to refer to the last report of the Committee on Public Accounts, which recommends that a system of purchasing should be established. My right hon. friend, speaking on this subject this morning, turned towards the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who, I understand, is the author of that suggestion, and said that men could not be made honest by legislation. That is very true, but legislation, if it cannot make men honest, certainly can minimize the effects of dishonesty, and that is all we can hope for. One of the last things we discussed during the last session of Parliament was the patronage list. I am free to say that all Governments since Confederation have had a patronage list; it is an evil to which my Government has to plead guilty, in common with all Governments before my time. The Government of Sir John Macdonald and that of Mr. Mackenzie had patronage lists. If there ever was a time when the patronage list should be dispensed with, it is the present; if ever a Government should dispense with a patronage list, the Government of the day should dispense with it. This Government should have said to all those who wanted to do business with it that there should be no political partisanship thought of and that orders would be given to the lowest tenderer. That has not been done.

Major General HUGHES: Does the right hon. gentleman know that it has not been done? I challenge him to name a Liberal in the Dominion of Canada who was ever refused an opportunity to tender, if he was qualified to do so.

Mr. MACDONALD: He was never asked.

Major General HUGHES: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Caldwell of Lanark and fifty other Liberals are contractors today.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Let me tell the hon. gentleman—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACDONALD: In my county, if a Grit doctor certifies to the physical condition of a man going to the war he is driven from the job, and a Tory is put in his place.

Major General HUGHES: The hon. gentleman refers to men who are only country practitioners?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I accept the correction of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, who says that there is no patronage list in his department at the present time.

Major General HUGHES: Not since the war began.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Whether or not there has been no patronage list in his department since the war began, everything has been worse since the war began. This is the report made by the Public Accounts Committee the other day, which was unanimously agreed to:

> In view of the evidence adduced during the course of their inquiry into the matters referred by the House to them, your committee desire to draw the attention of the House to the requirement for the inauguration of a system of purchase, inspection and audit that will adequately protect the country from irregularities and frauds.

It is the opinion, therefore, of the Public Accounts Committee that the system which has prevailed in the Militia Department since the war began does not protect the country against irregularities and frauds. That is enough to serve the purpose of my argument. We should have a new system; whether it should be established by legislation or not I do not know. At all events, the opinion of the committee was that something should be done. The Prime Minister stated this morning that in order to meet these views he was going to have a purchasing agent; he did not say whether the commission would consist of one person or of three persons. Whether it consists of one or of three may not be material, though I prefer three. We have the right to insist that henceforth in the Department of Militia all purchases of supplies shall be made by calling for tenders, and that no favours shall be extended to anybody. If we are to gain anything from this discussion or from the report of the committee, that is what we ought to insist upon. I promised my right hon. friend that in view of the work which we have to do I would abridge my remarks, and I intend to do so. Of course, it will be necessary for me to omit many material things which I would have dealt with.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Let me tell my right hon. friend that there is considerable time; he need not abridge his remarks too much.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Very good. If there is considerable time, there is one thing which I should like to discuss for a few minutes. There has been considerble talk of an election. I persist in the position that I have taken all along in regard to this matter. I have no opinion or suggestion to offer to the Government with regard to whether or not they should hold an election; that is their own business. We on this side of the House have endeavoured during the present session to forget as much as possible that we are party men.

Some hon MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do hon. gentlemen believe that if we had not tried to avoid party controversy during this session we should be within half an hour of prorogation at this moment? There are many subjects which should have been debated, but we did not debate them. There are many matters which we should like to discuss on this very occasion, but we refrain from doing so because, though we are party men, we believe and have believed all along that the one thing which should engross our attention at this time is the war in which we are now engaged. I repeat that I offer no suggestion to the Government in regard to an election; that is their own concern. My hon friend the Minister of Public Works the other day gave as a reason for going to the country the fact that the Senate chose, not to reject, but simply to amend or vary, a resolution, of this House. Nothing could be more flimsy than such a pretense as that. The Minister of Public Works said that the people were demanding dissolution in a voice of thunder because the Senate had dared to amend a resolution adopted unanimously by this House. But my hon. friend did not tell us that the resolution which we were then considering had been amended not only by the Opposition in the Senate, but by the Government as well. I was not aware of that at the time, but on looking over the proceedings of the Senate of March 31, I find that Hon. Mr. Lougheed moved, seconded by Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell:

That the said message be further amended by adding to the first section of the suggested enactment the following subsection:

Nothing herein contained shall affect the powers of Parliament under the British North America Act, 1886.

Here were two amendments: one suggested by the Opposition and one by the leader of the Government in the Senate. One of these amendments is considered to be treason, but as to the other no adverse criticism is offered. This shows that the Senate took a nobler and broader view of their duty than gentlemen on the other side of this House are disposed to do. The Senate discarded my opinion, as they discarded the opinion of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and the senators have shown an example of independence rather than of partisanship. But what does it matter? What do our little difficulties matter in the face of the great issues with which we are now confronted in the present war? We are party men, but under the present circumstances what we on this side of the House insist upon is that the troops who are going to the front to defend as noble a cause as ever engaged the attention of man, as noble a cause as any for which men have ever shed their blood, shall be as fully equipped as Canadian money and Canadian science can equip them, so that they shall discharge their duty in a manner worthy of their ancestors, take their full share in the struggle, and bring back peace and glory in the triumphant folds of their flag.

Major General HUGHES: Nothing would delight my heart more than to have a short time in which to assist in the digestion of the utterances of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition; but, as there is an arrangement between the two sides of the House and prorogation is at hand, I am compelled to reserve my utterances for the public platform. But let the right hon. leader of the Opposition rest assured that I shall have no hesitation in stepping into his own province on any platform he may choose, to discuss these questions on any and every occasion that he may select. I will select them if he does not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will Colonel Allison be along?

Major General HUGHES: And Flint will possibly have my hon. friend retained. I will not take up the time of the House, as there is an understanding to secure prorogation, and if I got started it is very hard to tell when I would stop. I shall content myself with telling the right hon. leader of the Opposition that I will take every opportunity of discussing these matters on the public platform throughout the length and breadth of the country.

Mr. BUREAU: I hope to see you in Three Rivers.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

DISTILLATON OF GRAIN.

Mr. LOGGIE:

1. Has the Government received a letter or a circular from the Womens Christian Temperance Union, protesting against the great waste of valuable grain, which is being converted into intoxicating liquors?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to take such means as will prevent the grain that is said to be now worse than wasted, being used for food instead?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Some members of the Government have received a letter or circular from the Women's Christian Temperance Union protesting against the great waste of valuable grain by its conversion into intoxicating liquors.

2. The Government has not come to any conclusion on the matter, and has not, as a matter of fact, yet given it consideration.

WAR TAX STAMPS.

Hon. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Postmaster General): I wish to answer a question put to me by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) in relation to the postage stamps that bear across their face the words "war tax." I may tell the hon. gentleman and the House that, after due deliberation, the department have come to the conclusion that the postage stamps which bear upon their face the words "war tax" may be used as postage.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The stamps which are furnished to banks, although they are for cheques and notes, etc., are postage stamps with the words "war tax" upon them. It does seem to me to be an anomaly to use a postage stamp as a stamp upon a receipt or note. Is that intended?

Mr. CASGRAIN: They are being used in the meantime until the Inland Revenue Department has had time to print their own stamps.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have seen a postage stamp on a bottle of soda water marked "war tax."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Is my hon. friend sure that it was soda water?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, and I looked around for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to partake of it with me.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yesterday I put a question to the right hon. gentleman who leads the House as to whether an Order in Council had been passed concerning the payment of a subsidy or guarantee of bonds to the Quebec and Saguenay Railway. I think that the right hon. gentleman perhaps did not catch the name of the railway, and I wish to refresh his memory and to know whether or not this Order in Council has been passed. I am informed it has been. Perhaps the Minister of Finance would tell me.

Mr. WHITE: I understood the Prime Minister, in reply to my hon. friend, to say that no Order in Council had been passed.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING COMMISSION.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to ask the Minister of Labour, whom I am glad to observe in his seat, a question upon a subject of very great importance and of very great interest to the people of this country. A long time ago, recognizing the great rapidity at which the cost of living was increasing, this Government, upon the recommendation, I understand, of the Minister of Labour, appointed a commission to inquire into the matter. I should like to ask the minister to inform the House what information has been gathered, what the commission has done, whether it is still at work, and when we may expect the report?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think there is sufficient time at my disposal to tell the House all that has been done by the commission appointed to inquire into the high cost of living. However, I may state in a general way that the commission took evidence at various places throughout the country. One of its members was assigned to the work of gathering certain information, and he has been at work on that for seven or eight months, but about a month ago he had to quit work, as he was run down both physically and mentally. In his enthusiasm he had overworked himself, and his physician compelled him to take a rest.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is his name?

Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. Coats, one of the best men in the service of this Government, an enthusiast, and highly skilled in the gathering of statistics; in fact, I do not think he has an equal in Canada. He has been working at the report, with the assistance of another gentleman in the Labour Department, for seven or eight months. He was compelled about a month ago to take a rest, but, in order to try and get the report out while this House was in session, he again took up the work much sooner than he should have done. I have gone over various portions of the report, and I can promise the House that it will be the best piece of work of its kind ever published; it will be a classic, which will be read by economists throughout the civilized world, and which the people of Canada will be proud of. I think the report will be published about the middle of next month; that is the very best Mr. Coats can do. However, it will be worth waiting for, and I can assure the members of this House that when it is published we shall have the best report on the question that has ever been given to the public in this or in any other country.

SOLDIERS' VOTING BILL.

The House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 111, to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise.—Hon. C. J. Doherty, Minister of Justice.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Senate has returned this Bill with two amendments. By one of them it is provided that there shall be appointed by the Governor in Council six scrutineers, three on the nomination of the leader of the Opposition and three on the nomination of the Prime Minister. In substance these scrutineers are to be entitled to be present at all the operations connected with taking of the vote and to have all the powers that the representatives of candidates have at any poll held in this country. They are to have the additional power of appointing deputies who shall have all the same powers that they themselves have with the exception of the power of appointment. That is almost in the exact words, at all events it is clearly on the lines, of a clause that was put for-

ward tentatively by myself in this House with a view of endeavouring to meet what I had understood to be suggested by the leader of the Opposition. The amendment, however, goes farther than that and proposes to amend a provision that is made in the Bill as passed by this House respecting the notice to be given by the officers before taking the vote. That provision reads as follows:

> At least eight days' notice in writing of the date and place where the vote of such volunteers will be taken shall be given to the said scrutineers by the regimental officer who will collect the votes as aforesaid, such notice to be addressed to such scrutineers in the care of the Secretary of the High Commissioner for Canada in London if the regimental officers are in Great Britain, to the care of the Canadian Commissioner in Paris if the said regimental officers are in France, Belgium or Germany.

In my judgment this last provision makes the amendment as a whole unacceptable. I think a brief reflection will make it clear that in so far at all events as the troops who may be on the continent of Europe are concerned, the operation of sending notice, that the ballots have reached the officer who is going to take the votes, back from that place to the office of the Canadian Commissioner in Paris in order that from that office there may be sent back to the place where the votes are going to be taken notice of the appointment of a scrutineer, creates a situation in which the delay may be so long that it may be impossible to have the voting put through. By reason of the disposition in regard to this notice, it would be impossible to accept the amendment as suggested. This delay would be obviated by providing that the notice shall be given in a manner analogous to the method already provided in the Act as it passed this House, that is that there should be a notice to the company, and once you have provided for the appointment of the scrutineers it would seem to be quite proper that in addition special notice should be given to the scrutineer who would be on the spot. That will go much more rapidly and much more promptly. I shall have to move that this amendment, as it comes to us from the Senate be not concurred in but that the Bill be amended in effect so as to secure what is the real object of the appointment of these scrutineers and to make simpler and more direct the method of giving notice to them of the holding of the poll.

The second clause of the amendment proposes that there shall be inserted in the Bill a provision that no proceedings shall be taken or had under sections 2 to 4 inclusive of this Act until a declaration has been obtained from the Secretary of State for War of Great Britain that a full and fair vote of such volunteers may be taken without prejudice to military discipline and without interference with the efficiency of military operations, and that the same be duly proclaimed in the Canada Gazette. For reasons that have already been given in this House upon the proposal of an amendment practically identical with this, it does not seem to me, or to the Government, that this proposed amendment would be acceptable. Indeed, it does not seem to us that there is any reason why any action outside of the action of this Parliament in the ordinary course should be required to give effect to these particular sections. But we attach great importance to the passing into law of these sections of the Act and in order to avoid if possible their being defeated by an absolute refusal to concur in this amendment in full, and while we decline to accept this amendment, we are prepared to offer an alternative, the alternative being that in so far as these particular clauses are concerned, they shall not come into operation until assent to them has been given by His Majesty in Council and that assent proclaimed in the Canada Gazette. It seems to us that if any outside authority should be required to bring this Bill, or any part of it, into operation, other than the usual authority which sanctions the Acts of this Parliament, the only authority to whose assent it should be submitted is His Majesty himself. Therefor I beg to move:

> That a message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House doth not concur in the amendments made by Their Honours to Bill No. 111, to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise, and that this House doth propose in lieu thereof that this Bill be amended by adding to subsection 2 of section 2 the following:
>
> There shall be appointed by the Governor in Council six scrutineers, three to be so appointed upon the nomination of the Prime Minister and three upon the nomination of the leader of the Opposition; such appointments to be made within ten days of such nominations respectively. One of each nomination may be present at the distribution of ballot papers and envelopes, the marking of affidavits, the marking of ballots, the closing of envelopes and the posting of the same, and may exercise all the rights which may under the Dominion Elections Act be exercised by candidates or their representatives at any poll. The actual travelling and living expenses of such scrutineers, at a rate to be fixed by the Governor in Council, may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and they shall be afforded facilities for

the performance of their duties. The said scrutineers may name such number of deputies as they may deem necessary, and said deputies shall have and be entitled to exercise the powers herein above conferred on said scrutineers;

And that in subsection 2 of section 2, the following words be inserted after the word "votes" in line 10 of the second page:

And shall give, in addition to the general notice, a special notice to any person whose ap pointment as a deputy scrutineer under the provisions hereinafter made has been notified to him, and shall permit any scrutineer or deputy scrutineer so named to be present at said proceedings, in the absence of any such scrutineer or deputy scrutineer on behalf of either party.

And further that the Bill be amended by adding immediately after section 3 the following:

3A. sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall not come into force until a proclamation by His Majesty in Council declaring them to be in force shall be published in the Canada Gazette.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: With regard to the first amendment, I would think there would be no objection either one way or the other; and if it is satisfactory to the Government, I have no objection to it; but with regard to the second amendment, there is a principle involved. Do I understand that this Bill is to be sanctioned partly by the Governor General and partly by the King?

Mr DOHERTY: As I understand it, this Bill as a whole will be sanctioned by the Governor General, but one of the provisions of it is that certain sections shall not come into operation until the assent of His Majesty in Council is expressed to it. This particular Bill itself provides a special condition for two sections of it being operative. The suggestion that came from the Senate was that the operation of these sections should be held up awaiting the expression of approval of one particular minister of His Majesty's Government. For reasons to which I need not again refer, we did not think it a right or proper thing to do, and for my part I do not think there is any necessity whatever for this provision for the assent of His Majesty; but because we want to go as far as we possibly can, perhaps even farther than we should, to avoid this legislation being defeated, we are willing to suggest to Their Honours of the Senate that in lieu of the provisions they suggest making the operation of the Bill subject to the assent of one of His Majesty's ministers, we should have a provision making it subject to the assent of His Majesty himself

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Does not that mean that the British Cabinet would have to assume the responsibility for the operation of this legislation?

Mr DOHERTY: It is made subject to the assent of His Majesty in Council, and the Parliament of Canada by this declares that it is willing, with regard to these two particular clauses, that they should not go into operation until His Majesty in Council, which as the hon. gentleman says, is the British Cabinet, expressess approval in the manner provided in the Bill. As I said, it is not that it seems to us necessary or even proper to make such provision, but we do attach such great importance to avoiding the substantial withdrawal of this measure that we are willing to go to this, which I may describe as the extreme length, to meet the views of the Senate, and to submit to this condition imposed on us to the effect that this Act should not go into operation solely because the Parliament of Canada so wills.

Motion agreed to.

On the return of the Bill from the Senate,

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Senate doth not insist on the amendments made to Bill No. 111, intituled An Act to enable Canadians on active military service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise, but doth concur in the amendments made by the House of Commons to the said Bill without any amendment.

DOMINIONS TO PARTICIPATE IN PEACE TERMS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask whether the Government have any information to give to the House in regard to the despatch which has appeared in the press that the Dominions will be called upon to participate in the peace proposals?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The communication that appeared in the press is genuine.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is it too late to lay the official communication on the table of the House? Perhaps it might be given to the press.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It already has been published.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Substantially as received?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

PROROGATION.

A message from His Royal Highness the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Mr. Speaker:

His Royal Highness the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable Senate.

Accordingly Mr Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

In the Senate Chamber:

The Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Royal Highness the Governor General, as follows:

May it please your Royal Highness:

The Commons of Canada have voted the supplies to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Royal Highness the following Bills:

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1915, and the 31st March, 1916.

An Act for granting to His Majesty aid for military and naval defence,

To which Bills I humbly request Your Royal Highness' assent.

To these Bills the Clerk of the Senate, by His Royal Highness' command, did thereupon say:

In His Majesty's name, His Royal Highness the Governor General thanks his loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these Bills.

His Royal Highness the Governor General was then pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act respecting a patent of John Millen and Son, Limited.

An Act respecting Seed Grain, Fodder and other relief.

An Act to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.

An Act to amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act, 1913.

An Act for the relief of Edith Marguerita Lyons.

An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

An Act to amend the Government Railways Act and to authorize the purchase of certain railways.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code.

An Act for the relief of Cecil Howard Lambert.

An Act to amend the Representation Act, 1914.

An Act to amend the Adulteration Act.

An Act to amend the Winding-Up Act.

An Act to amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act.

[Sir G. E. Foster.]

An Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

An Act to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.

An Act to amend the Canada Grain Act.

An Act to enable Canadians on Active Military Service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise.

After which His Royal Highness the Governor General was pleased to close the Fifth Session of the Twelfth Parliament of the Dominion of Canada with the following Speech:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In relieving you for the present from your arduous duties I desire to thank you for the diligence and zeal with which you have discharged them, and especially for the timely and effective measures which you have taken for necessary co-operation with the United Kingdom and the other Dominions of His Majesty in the tremendous war which has been forced upon our Empire. It is my earnest prayer and my firm hope that the aid thus promptly and generously given will contribute, in no small measure, to that complete and unmistakeable success of the allied arms which alone can bring an honourable and lasting peace.

As this great struggle proceeds there is no abatement in the intense earnestness and determination of the Canadian people to unite their efforts with those of all the British dominions for the maintenance of our Empire's integrity and for the preservation of its institutions and liberties. From Atlantic to Pacific the splendid response to the call for men has fully equalled all anticipations.

In common with all the people of this Dominion, I have been proud to learn that the Canadian soldiers have shown conspicuous bravery and efficiency in the field of battle, and that they have borne themselves worthily when fighting side by side with the best troops of the Empire.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In His Majesty's name, I thank you for the liberal provision you have made for carrying on the affairs of the country and for meeting the necessities of the war under the trying conditions which it has brought about.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I bid you now farewell, in the earnest hope that the terrible conflict in which the Empire is engaged may be brought to a speedy and favourable conclusion, and in the firm belief that our country under the blessing of Divine Providence, will then resume unchecked that career of marked progress and abundant prosperity which it is destined to enjoy.

The Speaker of the Senate then said:

It is His Royal Highness the Governor General's will and pleasure that this Parliament be prorogued until Tuesday, the 25th day of May next, to be here holden, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Tuesday, the 25th day of May next.

INDEX

FIFTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1915.

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r=first, second, or third reading. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Con.=Consideration. Div.=Division. M.=Motion. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Aberdeen Association—franking privilege, 1370

Achim, Mr. Honoré (Labelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Trade of Canada, 11
Members at the front, 12
Canada and the war, 13
Defence by Belgians, 14
Experimental farm for Labelle, 2072

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 4

Adulteration Act Amendment Bill (Maple Sugar). 1r., 1644. 2r., 1790. Com., 1790. 3r., 1993. *See* 2313

Adulteration of food—maple sugar, 1785

Aeroplanes, reported appearance of, 144

Agricultural implements. *See* Taxation

Agriculture
Agricultural Instruction Act, administration of, 2107
Animals, health of, 611, 1286, 2053, 2087, 2108
Bulletins, 2083, 2088, 2092
Cold storage, 2084
Dairying industry, 2080, 2103
Department
Estimates, 1228-1242, 2055-2109
French language in, 2077
Salaries, 2055
Experimental farms, 2056
Hog cholera, 627
Horses, 1230, 2104. *See* War supplies
Insect pests, 2078, 2109
Live stock, 309, 348, 2087, 2092, 2093, 2104
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 2090
Potatoes
Diggers, tariff on, 1174
Embargo on, 719, 772, 991, 1229, 2078
Powdery scab in, 2078
Shipment regulations, 1229
Seed grain. *See that title*
Seeds, improvement of, 2106

Aikins, Sir James A. M. (Brandon)
Boots, army, 2442
Food exports, government control of, 537
Recruits' attestation papers, 1988

Alberta
Military training area, 1557
Miners, unemployment of, 493
Oil leases, 48
Relief distribution, 242

Alert, revenue steamer, 1646

Aliens
Assistance to, 1218, 2053
Deportation of, 2122
Interned at Petawawa, 828, 998
Registration of, 48, 1147, 1733
See Criminal Code Amendment Bill

Allison. *See* War

Ames, Mr. Herbert B. (Montreal, St. Antoine)
Canadian patriotic fund, 394

Amherst
Armoury, 389, 1395, 1977, 2035
Camp, 1290, 1395
Custom house, 1646
Post office, 436, 1396, 1975
Redstone Company, 1864

Ammunition, distribution of, 1652

Anderson, T. A., employment of, 605, 761, 996

Animals. *See* Agriculture

Anticosti lightship, 309

Antigonish-Sherbrooke mail service, 46

Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1958, 1961, 1966, 2184

Arichat mails, 1184

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Budget, 577
Record of the Government, 580
Reciprocity, 582
Naval affairs, 582
British preference, 584
Flax industry, 585

Armstrong, Mr. J. E. (East Lambton)—*Con.*
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1911
Inland navigation rates, control of, 43, 249
Taxation—gravel and sand, 1163

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Canadian patriotic fund, 402
Dominion elections, 1919

Astronomical observatory, western, 1585, 1893

Atlantic and Lake Superior railway, 1468

Atlases
Dominion electoral, 2307
Immigration, 1576

Auditor General
Office of—non-employment of French Canadians, 2318

Australia, steamship service to, 1292

Aviation school, 1989

Bagot county mail service, 141

Baie des Chaleurs railway, claims against, 518

Ball, Mr. R. J. (South Grey)
Budget, 955
Government expenditure and employment, 955
War contracts, 956
Tariff and taxation, 956
The war and trade, 957
Dominion elections—hours of voting, 1914

Ballot, patent, allowance for, 1591

Bananas, tariff on, 1167

Bank Act Amendment Bill (loans for seed grain). Res., 1242. 1r., 1246. 2r., 1349. Com., 1349. 3r., 1359.

Banks and banking
Borrowings from Government, 147, 476
Finance Act, 1914, continued, 477

Barker, Hon. Samuel (East Hamilton)
War supplies—horses, 2103

Barnard, Mr. Geo. H. (Victoria, B.C.)
Submarines, purchase of, 107
Titles to real estate, fraudulent, 1223

Bathurst harbour, 46

Battlefields, historic, 1716

Bedard, L., dismissal of, 1652

Belgium
Emigration from, 632
Relief for, 1676

Bellemare, Mr. A. (Maskinongé)
Budget—agricultural production and the war, 809
Intercolonial railway ties, 309

Benjamin, H., employment of, 241

Bennett, Mr. R. B. (Calgary)
Bank loans for seed grain, 1356
Budget, 1089
Canada and the war, 1090
Fiscal policies, 1091
Expenditures on public works, 1094
Protection and free trade, 1096
Home market, 1097
British preference, 1101
Controverted elections, 1924, 2009, 2025
Dominion elections, 1899
Experimental farms, 2060
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, on Department of Interior, 2592
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2141
Relief for western farmers, 73, 1336, 1338
Senate, the, 2336
Soldiers, votes for, 2233, 2261, 2274
Supreme Court jurisdiction, 2054
Taxation—insurance companies, 1179
War supplies—horses, 2096

Bennett, Mr. Wm. H. (East Simcoe)
Canadian patriotic fund, 397
Freight rates, inland navigation, regulation of, 259
Grain shortages at elevators, 1946
Soldiers, votes for, 2257, 2475

Bickerdike, Mr. Robert (Montreal, St. Lawrence)
Capital punishment, 42, 127, 281, 1763
Immigrants, inspection of, 1574
Prison reform, 1761

Binders, imports of, 1649

Blain, Mr. Richard (Peel)
Budget, 794
British preference, 799
Trade of Canada, 800
Fertilizers, 801
War supplies, 802
Dominion elections, 1906, 1913

Blais, A., dismissal of, 1652

Blondin, Hon. P. E. (Minister of Inland Revenue)
Excise goods in bond, transfer of, 1644
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1644, 1790
Inland Revenue Department
Appointment of temporary officials, 1644, 1868
Deputy Minister, pamphlet of, 1724
Estimates, 503-513, 1717-1727, 2313

Blue-books, printing and distribution of, 1595, 2310

Boivin, Mr. Geo. H. (Shefford)
Granby mail service, 905
Lévis dry dock, 767
Patent shovel shield, 437, 1235
Shefford mail service, 1287

Bonaventure
Mail service, 769, 994, 2297
Purchase of war supplies in, 994

Boots, army, purchase of. *See* War Supplies

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Services of the Governor General, 20
Loyalty of Canadians of foreign origin, 20
Decease of members, 21
Army boot contracts, 21
Causes of the war, 22
Canadian contingent, 24
Aeroplanes, reported appearance of, 145
Aviation schools, 1989
British Columbia better terms commission, 2316
British North America Act, proposed amendment of. *See* Parliamentary representation.
Budget, 1058
Proposed war taxation, 1058
Conference with Opposition, 1058
Tariff proposals, 1060
British preference, 1061
Length of debate, 1064
Canadian High Commissionership, 2318
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, correspondence of, 2189, 2461
Canadian Pacific railway ocean services, 749
Canadian patriotic fund, 395
Canadian representative at Washington, 2315
Capital punishment, 140
Conservation Commission, 2324
Controverted elections, 1995, 2007, 2014, 2020
Copyright, 203
Divorce bills, 1988, 2187
Dominion elections, 2143
Dominion notes, issue of, 1537
Expropriation of lands for military purposes, 1549
External Affairs, department of, 2318
Farquhar, Colonel, death in action of, 1283
Food exports, government control of, 551
Fort Erie shooting case, 333

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister) —*Con.*
Franco-Canadian steamship service, 718
Government buildings rented—alleged misconduct of officials, 2050
House of Commons
Bowles, Mr. W. C., resignation of, 1526
Business of the House, 206, 1187
Committees, select standing, 74
Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, election of, 41
Representation in. *See* Parliamentary
Correction of clerical errors in Act (1914), 1557, 1994
Intercolonial railway branch lines, 1543
Lake of the Woods Technical Board, 1394
Liquor manufacture, suggested suspension of, 2327
Medical Council of Canada, 1251, 2316
Ministerial changes, 207
Monuments, erection of, 1251, 1252
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 1249 2322, 2326
National Transcontinental railway, operation of, 2125, 2135
Newspaper attacks, 2190
Nickel, export of, 3
Nova Scotia
Military forces, 561, 612, 687, 720, 905, 1432, 1441, 1500
Postal services, 904
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2143-2146
Parliamentary representation—proposed amendment of British North America Act, 1460, 2327, 2340, 2342. *See* Prince Edward Island
Prince Edward Island, parliamentary representation of, 327, 1460. *See* Parliamentary representation
Public Accounts Committee. *See* War supplies
Railway capitalization, 290
Reindeer, experiments with, 2315
Robertson, Lt.-Col. Struan. *See* Nova Scotia military forces
Senate. *See* Parliamentary representation
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 679
Soldiers
Comforts for, 293
Payment of, 2320
Votes for, 337, 2200, 2213, 2259, 2469, 2477, 2537
Submarines, purchase of, 105, 946, 955
Taxation—liquor duties, 1154
Unemployment, 2320
Valcartier land claims, 1549

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister) —*Con.*

War
Appropriations, 93, 1397
Canadian expeditionary forces—statement of mobilization and organization, 2364
Canadian troops in France, 204, 909
Engineering corps, 1525
Expenditures, statement of, 1397
Fair wages in war contracts, 38
Nova Scotia military forces. *See that title*
Pensions, 1188, 1394, 1450
Supplies, purchase of
Ammunition, 93, 1455
Binoculars, 2605
Boots, 21, 144, 204, 2450
British Government, for, 38, 2461, 2614
Carleton Drug Company, 2605, 2614
Committee of Council, 1246
Generally, 93, 945, 2461, 2538, 2602, 2610, 2614, 2617
Horses, 2098-2102, 2606, 2613
Shells, 38, 2614
Western farmers, relief for, 1330

Boulay, Mr. H. (Rimouski)
Agriculture in Quebec, 2076
Anticosti lightship, 309
Budget, 984
French Canadians in Government service, 985
Judges' pensions, 987
Aid to agriculture, 988
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, payments to, 1864
French language in Department of Agriculture, 2077
Immigration inspectors and the French language, 233
Intercolonial railway
Bridges, 897
Cement posts, 309
Dining car employees, 1485
Passenger service, 1485
Madawaska postal service, 1388
Marine service in Rimouski, 1256, 2304
Matapedia road, 2178
Ore refined in United States, 309
Voters' lists, errors in, 2309
War supplies—horses, 898, 1455

Bounties on lead and petroleum, 1936

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)
Dismissals, 1652
Intercolonial railway
Chaudiere employees, 1785
Lévis station, 831

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)—*Con.*
Lauzon dry dock, 1647
Lévis quarantine station, 241, 1290
National Transcontinental railway—Quebec terminals, 518
St. Romuald post office, 518
Telephone disinfectants, 2531
War supplies—horses, 830

Bowman, Mr. James (East Huron)
Budget, 930
Rival fiscal policies, 930
Development under protection, 932
Aid to agriculture, 934

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil)
Lévis shell factory, 519
Maple sugar industry, 513, 1794
Rigaud
Armoury, 631, 993
Dredging, 390
Wharf, 1786
Scales in cheese and butter factories, inspection of, 513
St. Zotique wharf, 390
War supplies
Horses, 388
Saddles, 521

Bradbury, Mr. George H. (Selkirk)
Budget, 715, 772
Pre-election promises, 716, 776
Expenditures on public works, 717, 772
British preference and the tariff, 781, 782
Cement merger, 784
Hudson Bay railway, 786
Seed grain distribution, 789
Experimental farms, 2066
Pollution of navigable waters, 3, 118
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 1321, 1882

Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Toronto Centre)
Inland navigation freight rates, regulation of, 254

British Columbia
Better Terms Commission, 2316
Labour troubles, 497
Militiamen on active service, 151
Steamship services, 1300

British North America Act, proposed amendment of, 1459, 2327

Brooks-MacNally mail service, 994

Brouillard, Mr. Ovide (Drummond and Arthabaska)
Gilbert, R., employment of, 1787
Stanfold model farm, 1993

Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Medicine Hat)
Alberta
Coal industry, 492
Oil leases, 48
Relief distribution, 242, 2188
Bank loans for seed grain, 1244
Blood Indian reserve, 763, 1323
Brooks-MacNally mail service, 994
Coal imports, 521
Coutts quarantine area, 150
Experimental farms, 2066
Food exports, government control of, 540
Lethbridge
Customs staff, 521
Field battery, 1646
Immigration inspector, 150, 1567
Postmastership, 143, 769, 1364, 1367
Wool storage, 828
Medicine Hat
Homestead inspection, 2123
Postmasters, 764
Rural mail service, 768
Mounted Police, Northwest, 1284
Oil and gas leases, 241
Railway charters, extension of, 724, 758
War supplies—horses, 631, 1146
Western farmers, relief for, 58, 947, 1244, 1340. *See* Bank loans
Wrentham post office, 142

Budget debate, 80, 352, 404, 442, 562, 613, 689, 709, 772, 833; amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 841, 905, 955, 999, 1058; div., 1141. *See* Taxation

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Cap de la Madelaine wharf, 2120
Inland Revenue, Deputy Minister of, pamphlet of, 1724
Maple syrup, adulteration of, 1792, 1800
St. Maurice river slides and booms, timber for, 2184
Soldiers, votes for, 2288, 2491
Taxation—postage stamps and war stamps, 2539
Three Rivers
Dredging, 2175
Harbour works, 2155
Public building, 1786

Burnham, Mr. John H. (Peterborough West)
Budget, 404
Unemployment, 405
British preference, 408
Eastern peril, 409
German menace, 411
Free trade, 413
Made-in-Canada movement, 414

Burnham, Mr. John H. (Peterborough West) —*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Balance of trade, 415
Ethics and industry, 416
Civil service, old men in, 1871
Controverted elections, 2011
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1907
Grain shortage, compensation for, 1956
Immigration and old age pensions, 1573
Mail carriers, remuneration of, 1374
Naval service, 1660
Peterborough government employees, 1285

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Minister of Agriculture)
Agricultural Instruction Act, administration of, 2107
Agriculture, Department of
Estimates, 2055
Bulletins, 2083, 2092
Cold storage, 2084
Dairying industry, 2081, 2103
Exhibitions, 2085, 2109
Experimental farms, 2056, 2058, 2072
Foot and mouth disease, 2088
Horse breeding, 2104
Live stock industry, 2092
Meat, inspection of, 2091
Potato scab, 2078
Public health, 2108
Parliamentary representation, 1994
Seeds, improvement of, 2106

Cadwell Sand and Gravel Company, 1166

Calgary civil servants, 1184

Calmer-Telfordville mail service, 1187

Canada Grain Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1644. 2r., 2030. Com., 2030. 3r., 2191. Sen. amdt., 2532

Canada Temperance Act, referenda under, 1590

Canada Year Book, 1938

Canadian expeditionary forces. *See* War

Canadian Manufacturers' Association and war supplies, 1667, 2189, 2461

Canadian Northern Railway Company, payments to, 150

Canadian Pacific railway
Capitalization, control of, 286, 726
Ocean services, 749

Canadian patriotic fund, 143, 1446, 1864

Canadian Patriotic Fund Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 204. 2r., 393. Com., 393. 3r., 404

Canadian Peace Centenary Association, 2315

Canadian Peat Society, 1865

Canadian representative at Washington, 2315

Canadian War Contingent Association, 2122

Canadian Wheatlands Company, 2188

Canadians in California, status of, 1189

Canals, 491, 632, 832, 1710, 1712
For individual canals, see their titles

Canning public building, 1979

Canso
Fish reduction works, 633, 767
Military guard, 1556

Cape Breton, customs service in, 222, 225, 227, 1650

Capital punishment, abolition of, 42, 127, 264, 1228, 1761

Cardigan-Annandale mail service, 1648

Cardin, Mr. P. J. A. (Richelieu)
Richelieu postal service, 1287

Cardin, D., employment of, 1993

Cardinal canal, 832

Carey, J. M., employment of, 993

Cariboo island breakwater, 308

Carleton retaining wall, 390

Carrick, Mr. J. J., M.P., service of, 561

Carroll, Mr. W. F. (Cape Breton South)
Aliens, registration of, 1147, 1733.
Bank loans for seed grain, 1352, 1358
Benjamin, H., employment of, 241
Budget, 989, 1012
Party truce, 1013
Naval question, 1014
Free trade, 1015
Proposed new taxes, 1016
Manufacturers and prices, 1018
Labour and the tariff, 1021
Liberals and the war, 1021
Aid to Belgium, 1022
Canadian Pacific railway ocean service, 743
Canadian patriotic fund, 393
Cape Breton customs service, 222, 225, 227
Explosives in mines, 1601
Food exports, government control of, 550
Foster, W. G., employment of, 898
Inland navigation rates, 255, 1687
Intercolonial railway—service of Mr. Gutelius, 1483
Iron and coal imports, 244

Carroll, Mr. W. F. (Cape Breton South)—*Con.*
Kelly, Edgar, employment of, 241
Livingstone, C. P., appointment of, 150
Miller, J., patent of, 1990
Mines Department, 1600
National employment bureau, 484-490
New Waterford
Postal service, 1360
Recruiting, 392
Customs service, 227
Nova Scotia
Fire insurance rates in, 1284, 1399
Postal service, 903
Patent medicines, alcohol in, 1717
Railway charters, extension of, 722
Smuggling, alleged, in Cape Breton, 222
Sydney pilotage commissioners, 1265
Sydney-New Waterford mail service, 1361
Sydney-St. Peter's railway, 608
Valcartier camp stores, 308
Vancouver Terminal Company, 1262
Voters' lists, preparation of, 1594
War supplies—horses, 607

Carslake Hotel purchase. *See* Montreal

Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)
Budget, 1066
The party truce, 1066
Revenue and expenditure, 1068
Taxation proposals, 1071
British preference, 1079
Canadian Northern Railway Company, 760
Civil Service appointments, 1144, 1285
Controverted elections, 1924, 2151
Dominion elections
Hours of polling, 1906
Voters' lists, 1897
Fraudulent titles to real estate, 1221
French, Field Marshal Sir John, 1444
Horse exports, 1234
Intercolonial railway
Fredericton land purchase, 168, 1475
Freight rates and trains, 156, 167
St. John and Quebec railway agreement, 1473
Militia—engineer services and works, 1513
Pollution of navigable waters, 124
Potato embargo, 719
St. John Valley railway, 46, 173, 1473
Soldiers
Pay of, 2320
Votes for, 2352
Southampton railway investigation, 142
Taxation
Agricultural implements, 1174
Customs valuation, 1154
Fertilizers, 1076, 1166
Tobique Indian reserve, 187, 193

Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)—*Con.*
Valley railway, 142
War supplies
Hay, 140, 241
Imported munitions, duty on, 1506
Motor truck tires, 1290

Casgrain, Hon. T. Chase (Postmaster General)
Aberdeen Association and the franking privilege, 1370
Montreal postal service, 1378, 2296
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2145
Pollution of navigable waters, 125
Post office
Contingencies, 1360
Department staff and salaries, 1359, 2295
Dismissals, 1367
Estimates, 1359-1394, 2295-2298
Letters for soldiers, 1419, 1422
Mail bag locks, 47, 1393
Mail carriers, payment of, 2297
Outside service, 1360, 1371
Parcel post, 1371-1375, 1384
Rural mail service, 1379
Stamps, sale and use of, 1391, 1393, 1422, 2297, 2624
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 661

Cattle. *See* Agriculture

Censorship, 1264, 1448, 1496, 1506, 1618

Charbonneau, R., employment of, 610

Chesley public building, 1646

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Campbell, Daniel, weights and measures official, 511
Cheticamp
Live-saving station, 1633, 1636
Marine medical service, 1269
Intercolonial railway branch lines, 1482, 1702
Inverness harbour improvements, 2052
McLeod, Mr., dismissal of, 1606
Navigable waters, removal of obstructions in, 347
Steam trawling, 246, 2306

Chisholm, Mr. William (Antigonish)
Antigonish-Sherbrooke mail service, 46
Eastern Extension railway land damages, 1469
Fenian raid bounty, 1546
Immigration to Nova Scotia, 1558
Intercolonial railway
Abutment contracts, 895, 1286
Branch lines, eastern Nova Scotia, 1478, 1482

Chisholm, Mr. William (Antigonish)—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway—*Con.*
Bridges, watchmen on, 763
Coal contracts, 769
Nova Scotia
Indians, 1308, 1310, 1312
Inland revenue officials, 507
Postal service, 1380
Oil for fuel, imports of, 143
Taxation—postal rates and stamp taxes, 1413
War supplies—clinic thermometers, 307, 521

Civil Service
Appointments, 213, 218, 1144, 1285, 1591
Commission, 992, 1612
Dismissals, 213, 218
Militia service, civil servants in, 312, 522
Reform, 895, 1189
Speech of Mr. Adam Shortt, 213, 232, 471, 634

Clark, Mr. Hugh (North Bruce)
Agricultural reports, 2083
Prison reform, 1766
Soldiers, votes for, 2282, 2351

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 27
Made-in-Canada campaign, 28
Canada's paramount duty, 30
Spending of moneys, 31
Party literature, 31
Election talk, 32
Claims of the Empire, 32
Budget, 863
Submarines in naval warfare, 864
Financial comparisons, 867
Home markets and the National Policy, 869
Borrowings or economy, 870
War and taxation, 872
Income tax, 872
British preference and made-in-Canada campaign, 873, 876
Effect of the new tariff, 875
Canadian patriotic fund, 404
Dismissals, 1366
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 640
Soldiers, votes for, 2201, 2217, 2468
Taxation
Income, 1197
Postage stamps and war stamps, 1415
See Budget
Western farmers, relief for, 67
Wetaskawin settlers, grievances of, 1565

Clarke, Mr. W. A. (North Wellington)
Budget, 1050
Canada and the war, 1051
The Government's tariff policy, 1051
Revenue and protection, 1051
Western conditions, 1052

Coal. *See* Mines

Coast Guard, steamer, 1866

Coasting trade, 296, 1933

Cochrane, Hon. Frank (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Canadian Pacific railway ocean services, 746
Canals
Soulanges, 1712
Staff, repairs, etc., 1713
Trent, 1712
Welland, 1710, 1713
Government purchase of railways, 1540, 1681
Hudson Bay railway, 1861
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines
Eastern Nova Scotia, 1467, 1477, 1482, 1701
Chatham, 1492, 1686
Bridges, 1492, 1686
Cape Breton improvements, 1687
Fredericton land purchase, 171
Freight rates and trains, 164
General management, 1489
Halifax terminals, 1688
Highway protection, 1687
Moncton
Death claim—Mrs. O'Rourke, 1475
Improvements, 1691
Subway, 1397
Mulgrave car ferry, 1473, 1693
Operation, 1472, 1690
Quebec solicitor, 1708
Rolling stock, 1695
Safety appliances, 1698
St. John and Quebec railway agreement, 1473
National Transcontinental railway
Construction, 1859
Government operation, 1802, 1816, 2128
Montreal connection, 1711
Quebec
Bridge, 1710
Terminals, 1860
Railways and Canals Department
Estimates, 1467-1495, 1685-1713, 1859
Staff and salaries, 1471
St. John Valley railway, 184

Cockshutt, Mr. William F. (Brantford)
Food exports, government control of, 526, 556
Naturalization, 610
Soldiers, votes for, 2266

Coderre, Hon. Louis (Secretary of State and Minister of Mines)
Canada Temperance Act, referenda under, 1590
Dominion electoral atlas, 2307
Mines Department
Electric smelting, 1602, 2313
Estimates, 1599-1612, 2313
Explosives in mines, 1601, 1604
Geological survey, 1607-1611
Investigations and experiments, 1603, 2313
Staff and salaries, 1599
Tar sands for road making, 1604
Printing and stationery, 1591
Scientific literature, international catalogue of, 1590
Secretary of State, Department of
Estimates 1588-1598, 2307
Staff, salaries, etc., 1588, 1589
Vincent, Mr. J. U., pamphlet of, 1724
Voters' lists, preparation of, 1594

Colcleugh, F. W. R., employment of, 1648

Cold storage. *See* Agriculture

Cole Harbour wharf, 517

Collingwood Ship Building Company, 519

Conservation Commission, 2314, 2324

Consolidated Fund expenditure, 1290

Contrecoeur public works, 1651

Cookshire post office, 1991

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland, N. B.)
Amherst
Camp, 1290, 1395
Military buildings, 1395
Redstone Company, 1864
Budget, 936
Economy or taxation, 938
The party truce, 938
Tariff burdens on farmers, 940
Patriotism-and-production campaign, 941
New Brunswick and war taxes, 943
Intercolonial railway management, 944
Grand Trunk Pacific railway, labour conditions on, 498
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 1685, 1706
Employees, enlistment of, 245
Management, 1487, 1491

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland, N.B.)—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway—*Con.*
Moncton
Death claim—Mrs. O'Rourke, 1475, 1713
Shops, 1696
Subway, 1397
Operation, 1708
Sackville, accommodation at, 606, 1693, 1706
Wages, payment of, 498
Mount Allison military instruction, 1524
New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, purchase of, 152, 1685
Post Office
Employees, inefficiency of, 1392
Rural mail service, 1390
Sackville
Home guard, 1517
Pilotage, 1266
Post office, 153
War supplies
Hay, 1289
Horses, 520
Seasickness cure, 152

Copper exports, 312

Copyright, protection of, 196, 1226

Corn imports, 152

Cost of Living Commission, 1395, 2625

Country Harbour gas buoy, 762

Courts. *See* Justice

Coutts quarantine area, 150

Cream exports, 294

Criminal Code Amendment Bills. 1r., 47, 205. 2r., 284, 304. Ref. to select Com., 476. Com., 1218. 3r., 1291. Sen. amdts., 2053

Crothers, Hon. Thos. W. (Minister of Labour)
Cost of Living Commission, 2625
Labour
British Columbia, troubles in, 497
Department
Estimates, 481-498, 501-503
Staff and salaries, 481, 502
Disputes, settlement of, 494
Employment bureaux, 485-490
Farm labourers, distribution of, 490
Grand Trunk Pacific railway, conditions on, 498
Railway construction and labour, 502
Railway employees, voting of, 2504
South Wellington mine disaster, 207
Technical education, 495, 502

Crothers, Hon. Thos. W. (Minister of Labour)—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
Telegraphers, conditions of employment of, 2532
Unemployment, 483, 493, 501
Wages
Payment of, 498
War contracts, on, 490, 503
Welland canal, on, 492

Cumberland rural mail, 1649

Customs
Agricultural implements, valuation of, 605
Alert, revenue steamer, 231
Department
Appointments and dismissals, 218-222, 228
Employees in war service, 217
Staff and salaries, 217-230
Fraudulent importation of horses, 229
Investigations, 611
Smuggling, alleged, 222
See Taxation

Customs Tariff War Revenue Bill. Res., 89, 1150, 1168. 1r., 1217. 2r., 1400. Com., 1400. 3r., 1405. *See* Budget, Special War Revenue Bill, *and* Taxation

Dagneau, John, employment of, 1866

Dairying Industry. *See* Agriculture.

Davidson, Mr. Avard L. (Annapolis)
French, Field Marshal, 1446

Davidson, W. W., employment of, 768

Delisle, Mr. Michel S. (Portneuf)
Dorion, C. N., employment of, 521
Government reports in French, 828
National Transcontinental railway
Portneuf claims, 993
Quebec terminals, 993
Quebec county telegraph service, 1187, 2122
St. Gilbert de Portneuf postmaster, 307
War supplies
Horses, 520
Motor trucks, 1186

Demers, Mr. M. Joseph (St. John and Iberville)
Allison, J. Wesley, services of, 1145
Horses, embargo on, 150
Adulteration of maple sugar, 1798
Montreal postal station, 1651, 2528

Descarries, Mr. Joseph R. (Jacques Cartier)
Budget, 1022
Canada's share in the war, 1023
Expenditures and taxation, 1024

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Civil Service reform, 895
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1911
Georgian Bay canal, 1971

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)—*Con.*
Hull
Inland revenue service, 1871
Post office repairs, 1985
Mica duties, 830
Ottawa-Hull
Postal rate, 766
Town-planning commission, 766
Patent medicines, 1717
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 659

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Aliens
Assistance to, 1218
Registration of, 1734
Canadians in California, status of, 1190
Canadian patriotic fund, 204, 393
Capital punishment, 264
Controverted elections, 1920, 1994-2030, 2148
Copyright, 201, 1226
Criminal Code amendments
Aliens, assistance to, 1218, 2053
Bawdy house, inmate of—penalty, 1227
Committee, select, on, 476
Dramatic copyright, infringement of, 1226
Military stores, fraud in sale of, 305, 1226
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 285, 1220
Doherty, Hon. C. J., pension of, 209, 1727
Dominion elections
Hours of polling, 1915
M. for select com., 205
Railway employees, voting of, 2499, 2501, 2502
Voters' lists, 1895
Dominion police, 1732
Exchequer Court
Expenses, 1731
Reports, 1730
Expropriations at Valcartier and Three Rivers, 1739
Insurance companies—licenses, 1247, 1399
Judges
Additional, for British Columbia and Alberta, 1428
Militia, in active, 1728
Salaries of, 1732
Superannuations in Quebec, 1186
Justice Department estimates, 1727, 2186
Maple sugar adulteration, 1793
Parliament, members of
Active service, on, 351, 440
Government contracts, and, 2143, 2145
Parliamentary representation, 1788, 1929, 1994
Penitentiaries
Kingston
Management, 1775
Release of Thomas Riley, 2259

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)—*Con.*
Penitentiaries—*Con.*
Prison reform, 1775
Ticket-of-leave system, 1736
Soldiers, votes for, 1643, 1874, 2195, 2229, 2259-2294, 2343-2364, 2462-2528, 2533-2538, 2625.
Solicitor General, office of, 1736
Supreme Court
Expenses, 1730
Jurisdiction—appeal in provincial election cases, 1988, 2053
Winding-up Act amendment, 2121, 2195

Doherty, Hon. C. J., judicial pension of, 209, 808, 987, 1727

Dominion Controverted Elections Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1714. 2r., 1920. Com., 1920, 1994, 2148. 3r., 2154. *See* Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill

Dominion Elections Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1714. 2r., 1895. Com., 1895, 2139. 3r., 2148. Select Com., 205. *See* 1527, 1929

Dominion lands and parks, 231, 1894

Dominion Notes Bill. Res., 1528. 1r., 1539. 2r,. 1653. Com., 1653. 3r., 1653. *See* 146, 479.

Dominion police. *See* Justice

Dominion Trust Company, 519

Dominions, overseas
Peace terms, and, 2627
Status of, 439

Dorion, C. N., employment of, 521

Douglas, Mr. James (Strathcona)
Agricultural literature, 2082
Calmar-Telfordville mails, 1187, 1376
Camrose, public building for, 1979
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 723
Homesteaders' wood rights, 1560
Killam mail route, 244
McInnes, T. R. E., employment of, 1864
Nice, Mr., employment of, 1991
Oil lease, George McRae, 243
Pope land lease, 993
Ribstone, village of, patent of, 243
Seed grain distribution, 1281
Strathcona postal service, 1376
Wainwright park, 236
War supplies
Horses 898, 1234
Overshoes, 762
Wetaskawin settlers, grievances of, 1560, 1565, 1566

Dredging. *See* Public works

Drill halls. *See* Militia

Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 604, 667, 948

Duck Mountain
Homesteaders, 992
Timber reserve, 1577

East Erinville post office, 519

Edmonton
Public building, 2044
Rifle range, 1552

Edwards, Mr. John W. (Frontenac)
Barriefield military road, 1515
Budget, 458
Government dismissals, 459
Government administration and expenditure, 459
Trade conditions, 462
The United States market, 463
Tariff increases, 464
British preference, 464
Tariff on agricultural implements, 467
The war crisis, 469
Cement duty, 469
Capital punishment, 136
Cheese inspection, 513
Dismissals, government, 459, 1366
Experimental farms, 2063
Farmers' relief, 1240
Hog cholera, 1286
Hughes, Major W. S., 435
Meat inspection, 2090
Parcel post, 1384
Patent shovel shield, 1236
Royal Military College, 1519
Penitentiaries
Kingston, 136, 515, 1740, 1773
Release of Thomas Riley, 2459
Stoney Mountain, 390, 1185

Electric smelting. *See* Mines

Emigration to United States, 242

Employment bureau. *See* Labour

Escuminac wharf, 1287

Estimates. *See titles of departments and subjects*

Eureka, steamer, 1265, 1268

Exchequer Court. *See* Justice

Excise, 1717

Exhibitions, 2085, 2109

Experimental farms. *See* Agriculture

Explosives. *See* Mines

External Affairs, Department of, 2314, 2318

Farmers Bank, depositors of, 391

Farmers' relief. *See* Western farmers, *also* Richmond county

Farquhar, Colonel, death in action of, 1283

Fenian raid bounty, 242, 1545, 1651

Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of. *See* Interior

Finance
Charges of management, 1715
Expenditure of Canada, 435, 764
Revenue of Canada, 152

Finance Act, 1914—proclamation continued, 476

Fish and Fisheries
Advisory board, 1270
American vessels, regulation of, 1650
Behring sea claims, 239
Bounties, 94
Breeding, 1278
Departmental estimates, 1270-1280, 1643
Exhibit at Toronto, 1277
"Fish and How to Cook It"—booklet, 239
Grants to fishermen, 2123
Herrings—regulation of prices, 1786
Hudson bay fisheries, 1280
Inspection, 48, 1271, 1279
Licenses, issue of, 1275, 2302
Lobsters
Close season, 45
Hatcheries, 1278
Seed, 309
Undersized, 1150
Officers, 1270
Oyster culture, 1275
Pickled fish, 48, 1278
Protection service, 1622
Quebec, in province of, 994
Reduction works, 633, 767
Shell-fish commission, 607
Steam trawling, 243, 246, 311, 312, 1622, 2305
Tidal waters, fisheries in, 116, 1270
Transportation, 80, 1494

Fisher, Captain E., employment of, 517

Fisher, Mr. J. H. (Brant)
Budget, 817
Expenditures on public works, 817
Made-in-Canada movement, 818
Indian Department, 819
Votes for soldiers, 819

Flour, Canada's gift of, to Great Britain, 1646

Food
Exports, government control of, 526, 556
Inspection, 2090

Foot and mouth disease, 611, 2053, 2087

Forest reserves, 233, 1579

Fort Erie shooting case, 143, 332

Fort William harbour improvements, 1970-1975

Foster, Mr. Arthur De Witt (King's, N.S.)
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 674
War supplies—horses, 629, 1033
Yarmouth harbour, 1289

Foster, Hon. Sir George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Belgian relief, 1676
Bounties on lead and petroleum, 1936
Budget, 999
The war and party co-operation, 999
Canada's finances, 1001
Protection or free trade and revenue, 1003, 1011
Financial inheritances of the Government, 1004
Methods of taxation, 1006
The tariff, 1008
British preference, 1009
Canada's part in the war, 1012
Canada Year Book, 1938
Civil Service appointments, 1872
Customs valuations, 1404
Freight rates, ocean, lake and river, 215
Gold and silver marking, 1875
Grain Act
Administration of, 1939-1954
Amendment Bill, 1644, 2191, 2532
House of Commons
Easter adjournment, 1645
Government business, 1787
Nickel export, 1937
Pit props, trade in, 1934
Steamship services, 1291. *See that title*
Trade and Commerce, 212, 1291, 1931. *See that title*
War
Appropriations, 1664, 1670
Supplies
Committee of Council on, 1666
Communications from Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 1668

Foster, W. G., employment of, 898

Fournier, L. H., employment of, 521

Fowler, Mr. George W. (King's and Albert)
Controverted elections, 1925
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 669

Fraser river, removal of obstructions in, 2303

Fraserville harbour, 392

Fredericton land expropriation, 168, 1475

Freight rates
Lake and ocean, supervision of, 215, 351
Inland navigation, control of, 43, 249

French Canadians
Civil Service, in, 985, 2318
Military service, in, 1149, 1442, 1445, 2189

French language
Blue books in
Printing and distribution, 1596, 2310
Translation, 504
Department of Agriculture, in, 2077
War stamps in, 1205

French river improvements, 1991

French, Sir John, Field Marshal, 1443

French Treaty and war taxes. *See* Taxation

Fripp, Mr. Alfred E. (Ottawa)
Votes for soldiers, 334

Furois, E., employment of, 1993

Gallon, W. J., employment of, 831

Garland, Mr. W. F. (Carleton, Ont.)
War contracts, 947

Gas inspection, 508, 1720

Gaspe
Deferred elections in, 1903, 2147
Purchase of war supplies in, 994
Railways, 518
Salmon fisheries, 116, 2302
Steamer service, 307, 833, 1286, 1301

Gaspé Bay anchorage, 998, 1449

Gauthier, Mr. Louis J. (St. Hyacinthe)
Budget, 586
Criticism of the Government, 587
Party truce and the war, 588
Taxation and protection, 589
British preference, 589
St. Denis rural mails, 993
War supplies—waterproofs, 609

Gauvreau, Chas., employment of, 390

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A. (Temiscouata)
Auclair expropriation, 1729
Fraserville harbour, 392
Intercolonial railway
Gutelius, Mr. F. P., 141, 309
Hay, cutting of, 1710
Ice contracts, 79
Riviere du Loup shops, 141
Lake Temiscouata postal service, 79
Louisville
Mails, 1288
Public building, 1288, 1459

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Temiscouata)—*Con.*
Malécité Indians, 1308
Menace newspaper, 991
Mousseau, P. A., employment of, 1992, 2122
Temiscouata postal service, 392
Genest, A., employment of, 767, 1185, 1368
Geological survey. *See* Mines
Georgian Bay Canal commission, 1145, 2183
German, Mr. William M. (Welland)
Admiralty court procedure, 1732
Bank loans for seed grain, 1245
Canadian patriotic fund, 1309
Controverted elections, 2000, 2010, 2016, 2152
Point Abino signal service, 1256
Soldiers, votes for, 2246, 2259, 2287, 2345, 2464, 2506
Solicitor General, office of, 1735, 1738
Taxation—patent medicines, 1423
War supplies
Bicycles, 995
Boots, 315
Welland canal, wages on, 491
Gilbert, Arthur, employment of, 1787, 1993
Gillis, A. B., employment of, 831
Girard, Mr. Joseph (Chicoutimi and Saguenay)
Agriculture in Quebec, 2073
Glass, Mr. S. Francis (East Middlesex)
Budget, 913
Tremendous effect of the war, 913
Patriotism and production, 914
Credits for farmers, 916
Reciprocity with the United States, 917
Conditions of trade and finance, 919
Canada's share in the war, 922
British preference, 923
Immigration, 924
Dominion elections—hours for voting, 1910
Privilege—the member for West Lambton, 2460
Gobeil, A., employment of, 895, 1458, 1962
Gold and Silver Marking Bill. 1r., 1645. 2r., 1875. Com., 1875. 3r., 1876.
Gordon, Mr. David A. (East Kent)
Wallaceburg customs collector, 766
Government Railways Purchase Bill. Res., 1539. 1r., 1544. 2r., 1681. Com., 1681. 3r., 1685.
Graham, Hon. George P. (South Renfrew)
Bank loans for seed grain, 1349
Budget, 1130
Party co-operation and the war, 1130
Public expenditure and the late Government, 1132
Graham, Hon. G. P. (South Renfrew)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Railway obligations—Canadian Northern and National Transcontinental, 1133
Reduction of expenditure, 1136
War taxes or not, 1137
British preference, 1140
Cadet corps, 1518
Capital punishment, 136, 137
Cardinal canal
Removal of houses, 832
Statistical officer, 832
Civil Service—temporary appointments, 1871
Coal imports, 633, 828
Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, 519
Dairying industry, 2081
Food exports, government control of, 554
Georgian Bay canal, 966
Commission, 2183
Horse breeding, 2105
House of Commons stenographers, employment of, during recess, 1360
Hudson Bay railway, 436, 631
Intercolonial railway
Expenditures, 1492
Halifax terminals, 1689
Level crossings, 1688
Kingston penitentiary—employment of Mr. Begg, 828
Morris, F., employment of, 151
National Transcontinental railway
Construction expenditure, 1859
Government operation, 1802, 1841, 2124, 2134
Quebec terminals, 606
Ocean freight rates, 751
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2144
Pollution of navigable waters, 124
Public health, conservation of, 2107
Railway capitalization, 289
Richards, James W., M.P., death of, 827
St. Thomas armoury, 1866
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 681
Soldiers, votes for, 336, 2262, 2274, 2350
Trent canal—claim of Cory & Laverdure, 1712
War
Appropriations, 1667
Canadians, enlistment of, 1447
Members of parliament on active service, 439
Supplies
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, communications from, 1667, 2189, 2461
Clothing, 2531
Salisbury Plain, at, 306

Grain
Administration of Act, 1939-1957
Amendment Bill. 1r., 1644. 2r., 2030. Com., 2030. 3r., 2191.
Distillation of, 2624

Granby mail service, 905

Grand Trunk Pacific railway
Expenditures on, 437, 1864
Labour conditions on, 498
See National Transcontinental railway

Gray, William (London)
Canadians in California, 1189
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1908
South Wellington mine disaster, 207
Transportation of Canadian forces, 763

Green, Mr. Robert F. (Kootenay)
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 721
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 1222

Gutelius, Mr. F. P., 141, 309, 1483, 1489

Guysborough
Branch railways. *See* Intercolonial
Fishery guardians, 313
Mail service, 519, 607, 633, 897, 1185

Half-breed scrip, 1287

Haliburton, recruiting at, 896

Halifax
Chartered steamers, 1647
Customs night watchman, 831
Military headquarters staff, 1514
Permanent force, supplies for, 2529
Public Works, 1458
Terminals, 764, 1688

Halifax and Eastern railway, 1466

Hall, R. P., appointment of, 763

Harbours. *See* Public works

Hawkesbury-Grenville bridge, 1648, 1992, 2176

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Cheticamp life-saving station, 1635
Dredging, 1252
Fish and Fisheries
Advisory board, 1270
Breeding, 1278
Departmental officers, 1270
Exhibit at Toronto, 1277
"Fish and How to Cook It"—booklet, 239
Grants to fishermen, 2301
Licenses, issue of, 116, 1275, 2302

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)—*Con.*
Oyster culture, 1275
Protection service, 1622
Steam trawling, 1622, 1624, 2305
Tidal waters, fisheries in, 1270
Fraser river obstructions, removal of, 2303
Hudson bay
Fisheries, 1280
Hydrographic surveys, 1626
Navigation, 1627
Karluk, steamer. *See* Stefansson
LeBlanc, seaman, 1642
Live-stock inspection, 348
Marine
British ships, transfer of, 1057
Coasting trade, 299
Government steamers, 312, 338, 1255
Hydrographic surveys, 1626
Ice breaking, 339, 1255, 1267
Life-saving service, 351, 1633
Lighthouse and coast service, 1256-1260, 1267
Maritime road, 1267
Masters and mates, examination of, 340
Navigation
Aids to, 1258
Obstructions to, 347, 2303
Schools of, 346
Pilotage, 1265
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1252
Seamen, sick and distressed, 1269
Shipping casualties in 1914, 833
Signal service, 1264
Steamboat inspection, 1270
Unseaworthy vessels, 345
Wrecking plants, 349
Wrecks, investigations into, 342
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 338-350, 1252-1280
Naval service, 237, 1612, 1654, 2298
Navigable waters, pollution of, 121
New Brunswick shale industry, 1608
Northern waters, patrol of, 1631, 2298
Parliamentary representation, 2332
Prince Edward Island winter mail service, 348
Quebec Harbour Commission—resignation of Sir William Price, 1966
Richard, Mrs. Margaret, claim of, 1642
St. John custom house, 1982
Shelburne fishery inspector, 1271
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 642
Stefansson expedition, 1631, 1632, 2298
Submarines, purchase of, 100
United States flag, alleged flying of, on wireless station, 1617
Wireless telegraphic service, 1263

Hepburn, Mr. B. R. (Prince Edward, Ont.)
Steamboat rates, 257

Higenbotham, E. N., dismissal of, 1364

High Commissioner, Canadian, 391, 2318

Homesteaders' wood rights, 1560

Horn, Werner, extradition of, 44, 79

Horses
Export to the United States, 150, 1230
Breeding, 2103
Fraudulent importation of, 229
See War supplies

House of Commons
Business of the House, 206, 687, 1187
Committees, select standing, 74
Deputy Speaker, election of, 41
Easter adjournment, 1645
Members
Active service, on. *See* Senate and House of Commons
Government contracts, and, 1242, 2139
Indemnity of, 2309
Officials, appointment of, 144, 1526, 1863, 2258
Reading room, taking of papers from, 611
Representation. *See* House of Commons Representation Act Amendment Bill, Parliamentary representation, *and* Prince Edward Island
Sessional employees, 2109
Stenographers, post-sessional employment of, 1360
Voters' lists, preparation of, 1594, 2111, 2309

House of Commons Representation Act Amendment Bill (correction of clerical errors). 1r., 1557. 2r., 1788. Com., 1788, 1929, 1994. 3r., 1994.

Hudson bay
Fisheries, 1280
Hydrographic surveys, 1626
Navigation, 1627

Hudson Bay railway
Construction, 436, 1861
Cost of mileage, 631, 1148
Le Pas bridge, closing of, 606
Wages of employees, 1395

Hughes, Major W. S., appointment of, 435

Hughes, Mr. James J. (King's, P.E.I.)
Brudenell wharf, 2114
Budget, 1027
Financial administration, 1028
Taxation, prosperity, and revenue, 1029
Governments and expenditures, 1030
Civil service administration, 1032
War contracts, 1033

Hughes, Mr. James J. (King's, P.E.I.)—*Con.*
Cardigan-Annandale mail service, 1648
Charlottetown
Harbour, 2114
School of navigation for, 347
Controverted elections, 2013
Cost of Living Commission, 1395
Drill halls, use of, 2036
Earl Grey, steamer, sale of, 312
Enlistment from the active militia, 1456
Fenian raid bounty, 1545
Food exports, government control of, 543
House of Commons reading room, 611
Liquors and tobaccos in bond, 314
Little Sand breakwater, 2117
North lake harbour, 2114
Potatoes, exportation of, 1229, 2078
Prince Edward Island
Mail service, 348, 1378, 1385
Marine life-saving service, 351, 1637
Parliamentary representation, 316, 331
Public works, 2114
Railway, 1704, 1707
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 673
Souris life-saving station, 1637
Taxation—cheques, 1203

Hughes, Hon. Major General Sam (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Allison, J. Wesley, services of, 1145, 1452, 1508, 1669
Ammunition, purchase of, 1451-1455, 1506-1512, 1669, 1867
Aviation, 1989
Boots, army, purchase of, 2455
Cadet corps, 1518
Canadian troops in the firing line, 613
Censorship, 1448
Dominion arsenal, 1506
Duty on imported munitions, 1506
Edmonton rifle range, 1553
Engineer services, 1513
Enlistment. *See* Recruiting
Fenian raid bounty, 1546
French Canadians, enlistment of, 1442, 1445, 1447
Haliburton recruiting, 896
Halifax headquarters staff, 1515
Home guards, 1516
Militia estimates, 1428, 1496, 1544
Motor trucks, purchase of, 1146
Nova Scotia military forces, 1396, 1436
Permanent force, Canadian, 1515
Prince Rupert Rifles, disbandment of, 1522
Recruiting, 438, 1680, 1989
Rifle ranges, 1553
Robertson, Struan, Lt. Col., 1396, 1436

Hughes, Hon. Major General Sam (Minister of Militia and Defence)—*Con.*
Royal Military College, 1522
Salisbury Plain, supplies at, 439
Schools of military instruction, 1524
Shooting by sentries, 2124
Training camps, 1457
Valcartier
Camp, 1514, 1553
Land claims, 523, 1513, 1549
War
Appropriations, 1662
Supplies. *See that title*

Hull
Inland revenue service, 1871
Post office repairs, 1985

Hydrographic surveys. *See* Marine

Ice-breaking. *See* Marine

Immigration
Agencies, 1558-1562
Inspection, 233
Officials suspended, 243
Oriental, 1576
Philadelphia agent, 522
Statistics, 1147

Indians
Blood reserve, 763, 1323
British Columbia, 1324, 1892
Department estimates, 1306-1328
Education, 1325
New Brunswick, 1317
North West Provinces and Territories, 1319-1324, 1876
Ontario and Quebec, 1306-1309, 1328
Nova Scotia, 1310, 1325
St. Peter's reserve, 1320, 1877
Tobique reserve, 187
Trust fund, 1327

Industrial disputes. *See* Labour

Inland Revenue Amendment Bills
Temporary officials, appointment of. 1r., 1644. Res., 1868. 2r., 1874. Com., 1874. 3r., 1994
Transfer of excise goods in bond. 1r., 1644. 2r., 1868. Com., 1868. 3r., 1868

Inland Revenue Department
Deputy Minister, 438, 1723
Estimates, 503-513, 1717-1723, 2313
Staff and salaries, 503, 1717

Insect pests. *See* Agriculture

Insurance
Amendment Bill (renewable term policies). 1r., 351
Companies Extension of Time Bill. Res., 1246. 1r., 1249. 2r., 1399. Com., 1399. 3r., 1400. *See* Taxation
Department, 1716

Intercolonial railway
Abutment contracts, 895, 1286
Atlantic sugar refinery site, 150
Bathurst spur, 46
Block signals, 1690
Boulay, Messrs., employment of, 2530
Branch lines in eastern Nova Scotia, 44, 519, 992, 1467, 1473-1483, 1700
Bridges
Strengthening of, 1492
Substructures of, 897
Watchmen on, 608, 763
Cape Breton facilities, 1699
Cement posts, contracts for, 309
Chaudière employees, 1785
Coal tenders, 769, 1147, 1688
Courtenay bay spur line, 1698
Eastern extension land damages, 1469
Employees on military service, 217, 245
Envelopes, importation of, 896
Equipment, 1698
Estimates, 1472-1495, 1685-1704, 1706
Fish transportation, 80, 1494
Fredericton land expropriation, 168, 1475
Freight rates and trains, 156
French-speaking employees, 1485
German spy, suspected, 610
Ice contracts, 79, 311
Lévis station, 831
Management, 1483-1493
Moncton
Death claim—Mrs O'Rourke, 1475
Improvements, 1397, 1691
Mulgrave car ferry, 1693
Operation, 1472, 1706
Prince Edward Island car ferry, 1473
Pugwash spur line, 391, 1693
Quebec, solicitor for, 1708
Receipts and expenditures, 143
Riviere du Loup shops, 141
Rolling stock, 1695
Sackville improvements, 606, 1693, 1706
Safety appliances, 1698
Shims, contracts for, 768
Ties, contracts for, 309
Union station culvert, 608
Wallace spur, 391, 1694
See Government Railways Purchase Bill.

Interior Department
Estimates, 231-237, 1281, 1558-1585, 1893
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2539
Staff, salaries, etc., 232, 1558, 1570

International railway service, 1470

Iron
Imports, 244
Ores, 309, 2313

Jameson, Mr. Clarence (Digby)
Unseaworthy vessels, 345

Johnston, J. W., employment of, 608

Jordan East breakwater, 390

Judges Act Amendment Bill. Res., 1428. 1r., 1428. 2r., 1544. Com., 1544. 3r., 1544.

Justice
Admiralty court procedure, 1732
Department estimates, 1727, 2186
Dominion police, 1732
Exchequer Court
Expenses, 1731
Reports, 1730
Judges
Militia, in active, 1728
Pensions, 765, 1727
Salaries, 1732
Superannuation in Quebec, 1186
Solicitor General, office of, 1735
Supreme Court
Expenses, 1730
Jurisdiction—appeal in provincial election cases, 1988, 2053

Kamouraska lighthouse, 897

Karluk, steamer. *See* Stefansson

Kay, Mr. William F. (Missisquoi)
Cream exports, 294
Krans, J., employment of, 1185, 1286
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1785
Philipsburg-St. Armand mail service, 249, 313, 995
Rural mail carriers, payment of, 2297
Soldiers, votes for, 2255
Stanbridge rural mail service, 995

Kelly, E., employment of, 241

Kemp, Hon. A. E. (East Toronto)
Dominion elections—hours for polling, 1908

Killam mail route, 244

Killarney and Manitowaning mails, 898

Kingston penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Kitsilano Indian reserve, 1892

Knowles, Mr. William E. (Moosejaw)
Exchequer Court reports, 1730
Experimental farms, 2057, 2061, 2071
Gold and silver marking, 1875
Homestead entries, cancellation of, 1868
Inland Revenue Department appointments, 1870
Soldiers, votes for, 2262, 2267

Krans, J., employment of, 1185, 1286

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond, N. S.)
Arichat mail service, 1184, 1372
Bank borrowings from Government, 147
Bourgeois river-Cannes mail service, 1389
Budget, 449
Canada and the war, 449
Government's financial record, 450
Economic conditions, 451
Cement duty, 452
Civil service, 452
Revenue and expenditure, 454
Fishermen and the tariff, 455
The war taxes, 457
Capital punishment, 138
Customs Department dismissals and appointments, 219, 222, 898
Dominion elections, 1912
Dominion notes, 146
Fenian raid bounty—claims of widows, 1545
Fishing bounties, 94
Food exports, government control of, 547
Gobeil, A, employment of, 895, 1458, 1962
Grandigne Ferry mail service, 1184, 1372
Haliburton recruiting, 896
Intercolonial railway
Atlantic sugar refinery site, 150
Eastern Nova Scotia branch lines and extensions, 992
Management, 1490, 1493
Johnston, J. W., employment of, 608
Loans, Imperial Government, to Canada, 146
Mail carriers, pay of, 1371
Nova Scotia
Indians, 1310, 1312, 1317, 1325
Military forces, 481, 561, 687, 1396, 1428
Postal service, 900, 1389
Parliamentary representation of Maritime Provinces, 325
Richmond county
Customs service, 219, 222, 228
Railways, 992
Robertson, Lt.-Col. *See* Nova Scotia military forces
St. Paul's Island life-saving station, 608
Squid imports, 244
Steam trawling, 1622
Trent Canal commission, 632

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond, N.S.)—*Con.*
War supplies
Binoculars, 2188
Medical, 149, 1866
West Arichat customs, 898

Labour
British Columbia troubles, 497
Department
Estimates, 481-498, 501-503
Staff and salaries, 481, 497, 502
Disputes, settlement of, 245, 297, 494, 501
Employment bureau, national, 352, 484-490, 607
Fair wages in government contracts, 240, 391
Farm labourers, distribution of, 490
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, employees of, 498
Railway construction, inspection of, 502
Telegraphers, conditions of employment of, 1786, 2532
Unemployment, 308, 483, 492, 605, 2320
Wages
Payment of, 498
War contracts, on, 38, 40, 240, 490, 503
Welland canal, on, 491

Lachance, Mr. Arthur (Quebec Centre)
Foreigners, deportation of, 2122
Lauzon dry dock, 1866
Montmagny, wreck of, 1867
National Transcontinental railway—Quebec terminals, 1818, 1867
War supplies—sheepskins, 1866

Lafortune, Mr. David A. (Montcalm)
Budget, 1033
Nationalists, 1034
School question, 1039, 1049
Tobacco culture, 1041
Agriculture, 1041
Highways, 1046
Bankruptcy law, 1047
Exhibitions, 1047
Cattle embargo, 1048
Insolvency Act, 1048
Capital punishment, 276
Montcalm postal service, 1385
Privilege—report in Montreal Gazette, 1057
St. Jacques l'Achigan public building, 2322

Lake St. John hydrographic work, 896

Lake Temiscouata postal service, 79

Lake of the Woods Technical Board, 1394

Lancaster, Mr. Edward A. (Lincoln and Niagara)
Canadian Northern Railway Company, 708, 758

Lancaster, Mr. Edward A. (Lincoln and Niagara)—*Con.*
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 705, 721
Life insurance—renewable term policies, 351
Private Bills
Senate amendments, 1371
Suspension of rules, 1527
Toronto Eastern Railway Company, 708
Van Buren Bridge Company, 709, 760
Vancouver Terminal Railway Company, 990

Lanctot, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Budget, 804
Canada's participation in the war, 804
The war taxation, 805
Government extravagance, 806
Expenditures on public works, 807
Payments to Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Ferguson and the Minister of Justice, 808
Doherty, Hon. C. J., pension of, 808, 1727
Furois, Eugene, employment of, 1993
Gauvreau, C., employment of, 390
Grand Trunk Pacific expenditure, 437
Judges' pensions, 1727
Laprairie protection works, 437, 2156
Laprairie-Napierville rural mail service, 1380
Montreal resident engineer, 437
Pelletier, Hon. L. P., trip of, 2529
Pettet, W. V., employment of, 2123
Quebec bridge, 437
Rhoda, steamer, 2531
St. Lambert post office, 1648

Land speculation. *See* Real estate

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)
Audette, L., employment of, 2122
Cardin, E., employment of, 1993
Charbonneau, Rodrique, employment of, 610
French, war stamps in, 1204
Ile de Kamouraska light, 897
Intercolonial railway—envelopes, imported, 896
Lake St. John hydrographic work, 896
National Transcontinental railway
Bridgekeepers, 897
Station employees, 1143
Quebec
Post office revenues, 896
Grain elevators, electric power for, 2123
Roy, F. X., employment of, 992
St. Anselme government employees, 1993
St. Germain de Kamouraska wharf, 2163
St. Mathieu dredging, 2173
Soldiers, votes for, 2507

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)—*Con.*
Taxation
Cheques, 1202
Spirituous liquors, 897
Theberge, J., employment of, 2529
Valcartier
Lighting, 2123
Lumber supplies, 2122
Vallée, L. O., dismissal of, 436

Lapointe, Mr. Louis A. (Montreal, St. James)
Montreal barracks, 2035
War taxes, 1217

Laprairie protection works, 437, 2156

L'Assomption
Public employees from county of, 2528
Wharf, 1145

Last Mountain Lake dredging, 311

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Quebec East)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Progress of the war, 15
Significance of the struggle, 16
British sovereignty and the Dominions, 17
Conscription, 17
Canada's expenditure on the war, 18
War contract frauds, 18
Aeroplanes, reported appearance of, 144
Budget
Attitude of the Opposition, 834, 1065
Financial situation of the country, 836
The Government's financial policy, 836
Retrenchment and economy, 837
The new taxation—special taxes, 837
Taxation on railway travelling, 838
Customs tariff increases, 839
Taxes on British goods, 840
Proposed amendment, 841
Civil Service—speech of Mr. Adam Shortt, 634
Controverted elections, 1995, 2008, 2021
Dominion notes, 1536
Farquhar, Colonel, death in action of, 1283
Ferguson, T. R., report of, 2568, 2620
Fort Erie shooting case, 332
High Commissionership, Canadian, 391
House of Commons
Bowles, W. C., resignation of, 1526
Business of the House, 206, 1188, 1787
Deputy Speaker, election of, 41
Easter adjournment, 1645
Intercolonial railway branch lines, 1540
Killarney-Little Current mail service, 898
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1791
Ministerial changes, 208

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Quebec East)—*Con.*
National Transcontinental railway
Construction, 1859
Government operation, 1813, 1842, 2127, 2138
Quebec terminals, 1860
Naval Service of Canada, 1661
Nova Scotia military forces—language of Minister of Militia, 1440
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2143, 2147
Parliamentary representation
House of Commons, 328, 1789, 1994
Senate, 1460, 2327, 2341
Pollution of navigable waters, 123
Privilege—Federal Press Agency leaflet, 2189
Railway employees, voting of, 2500
Seed grain, bank loans for, 1243
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 634
Soldiers, votes for, 2206, 2280, 2348, 2360, 2464, 2484, 2524, 2536, 2627
Supreme Court jurisdiction—appeals in provincial election cases, 2054
Taxation
Bananas, 1167
Corporations, 1192, 1196
Customs valuations, 1404
French Treaty, articles under, 1215, 1422
Insurance companies, 1178
Money orders, 1205
Penalties, 1586
Postal rates and stamp taxes, 1415
Railway tickets, 838, 1198, 1200
Spirits, 1153, 1156
Telegraphic messages, 1192, 1194
Valcartier land claims, 522, 1546, 1739, 2621
War
Expenditures, 1142, 1398
Supplies, purchase of, 144, 2617
See Address *and* Budget

Lauzon dry dock, 1647, 1866, 1971

Lavergne, Armand, Lt.-Col., 1517

Law, Mr. Bowman B. (Yarmouth)
Amherst
Armoury, 389
Post office, 436
Budget, 820
Favourable to war appropriation, 820
Taxes and governmental extravagance, 820
Conservative party platform, 821
British preference, 823
Duties on fertilizers and feeds, 823
Postal rates, 824
Prohibition, liquor, 824
Chaplain to oversea forces, 242

Law, Mr. Bowman E. (Yarmouth)—*Con.*
Fish reduction works, 767
Fisher, Ward, fishery inspector, 1271
Indians, Nova Scotia
Claim of Dr. A. J. Deveau, 1314
Yarmouth agent, 1310
Jordan East breakwater, 390
Long Beach lobster pond, 309
Port Hawkesbury public building, 1981
Potato embargo, 719
Schools of navigation, 1260
Shelburne
Fishery inspector, 1271
Fog alarm, 389
Taxation
Fertilizers and feeds, 823, 1165
Letters and postcards, 1207
Newfoundland partridge berries, 1167
Toronto Home Guard, 243
War supplies—horses, 766, 898
Wrecking plants for Bay of Fundy, 350
Yarmouth
Cattle purchases in, 309
Fishery guardians, 313
Harbour, 607
Marine hospital, 832
Postal service, 313, 1361
Yarmouth-St. John steamship services, 1305

Le Blanc, seaman, 896, 1639

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1958
Aylwin irrigation tract, 2571
Copyright, 196
Emigration to the United States, 242
Farmers Bank depositors, 391
Gobeil, A., employment of, 1965
Labour unemployment, 308
Mail bag locks, 46
Pelletier, Hon. L. P., testimonial to, 211
Prince of Wales fund and government loans, 244
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 2625
Quebec Harbour Commission—resignation of Sir William Price, 1965, 1966
Royal Society of Canada, accommodation for, 245
Soldiers
Free postage for, 338
Votes for, 2516
Taxation—patent medicines, 312
War supplies
Boots, 48, 244
Canvas shoes, 389
Cartridges, 242
Medical, 308, 315
National Drug Company, 312
Slippers, 389

Leonardsville dredging, 312

Lethbridge
Customs staff, 521
Field battery, 1646
Immigration inspector, 150, 1567
Postmastership, 143, 769, 1364
Wool storage, 828

Lévis
Dry dock, 767
Quarantine station, 241, 1290
Shell factory, 519

Life-saving *See* Marine

Liquor
Bonded, 314, 897
Inspection, 1720
Manufacture, suggested suspension of, 2327

Live stock. *See* Agriculture

Livingstone, Charles P., appointment of, 150

Loans
Canadian Government, to banks, 147, 476
Imperial Government, to Canada, 146, 522

Lobsters. *See* Fisheries

Loggie, Mr. William S. (Northumberland, N.B.)
Budget
Reciprocal trade with United States, 925
Canada's part in the war, 925
Financial requirements, 925
Taxation proposals of Government, 926
Barbed wire, 927
Pork, 928
Raw materials, 928
British preference, 929
Chatham public building, 1982
Grain for distillation, 2624
Intercolonial railway
Chatham branch, 1493, 1685
Transportation of fish, 1494
Newcastle wireless station—alleged flying of United States flag, 1616
Soldiers, votes for, 2256

Longard, G E., employment of, 831

Longueuil, dredging at, 438

Louisville
Mails, 1288
Post office building, 1288, 1459

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Members of Parliament at the front, 36
Purchase of war supplies, 37
Fair wages and war contracts, 37
Newfoundland and Confederation, 39

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)—*Con.*

Alberta coal miners, unemployment among, 494
British Columbia militiamen on active service, 151, 1544
Budget
Criticism of Government, 1103
The Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Budget, 1105
Proposed taxation not for war, 1106
Borrowings, from England, 1106
Liberal administration, 1108
The Minister of Finance, tariff and expenditures, 1108
National Transcontinental and Canadian Northern railways, 1111
British preference, 1111
Naval question, 1113
Political parties and the war, 1114
Canadian Pacific railway ocean services, 747
Canadian patriotic fund, 398
Cariboo Island breakwater, 308
Coal
Areas in Nova Scotia, 1609
Lands, government, leases of, 1611
Controverted elections, 2002
Dominion elections, 1908
Expenditure of Canada, 435
Fair wages, 490. *See* Address
Fenian raid bounty, 242
Indians, Nova Scotia, 1310, 1313
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, amendment of, 245
Inland Revenue Department, administration of, 503
Insurance companies—extensions of time, 1248
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 1477
Bridge watchmen, 608
Claim of Mrs. Higgins, 1477
Coal tenders, 1147
Pictou harbour bridge, 1477
Receipts and expenditures, 143
Train service, 142, 167
Union station culvert, 608
Liquor manufacture, suggested suspension of, 2327
Macdonald, Wm., employment of, 1288
McLeod, J. W., employment of, 896
McNeil, Wm., employment of, 1648
Members of Parliament on active service, 36, 439
Naval service, 1621. *See* Budget.
New Glasgow
Dredge pontoons, cost of hauling, 1992
Mails, 517

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)—*Con.*

Nova Scotia
Coal areas, 1609
Indians, 1310
Military forces, 608, 1434, 1499
Parliamentary representation, 2338
Patents, renewal of, 1261
Pictou (county)
Fishery guardians, 245
Mail service, 244, 610, 995, 1288, 1458, 2123, 2188, 2297
Medical examiners for volunteers, 762
Pictou (town) winter freight handling, 246
Pictou Island telephone service, 143, 1258
Pit props, trade in, 1934
Prince Rupert Rifles, disbandment of, 1522
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 1222
Revenue of Canada, 152
River John customs sub-collectorship, 142
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 676
Soldiers, votes for, 2251, 2476, 2484, 2505, 2533
Stellarton public building, 763
Suckling, Rev. W. T., military chaplain, 1867
Taxation—cheques, 1409
Technical education, 245, 495, 496
United States flag, alleged flying of, at wireless station, 1618
Vale railway, 245
War supplies
Boots, 2430
Fair wages and war contracts, 37, 490
Horses, 388, 520, 894, 994, 2123
Oliver equipment, 1992
Wireless stations, control of, 1618

Macdonell, Mr. A. C. (Toronto, South)
Budget, 367
Answers to Opposition critics, 367
A satisfactory budget, 369
War loans and taxation, 371
Protection and British preference, 373
Public debt and expenditures, 375
Opportunities for Canada's trade, 377
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1903, 1914
Soldiers, votes for, 2249
Vancouver Terminal Company, 1262

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)
Banks, Government advances to, 478
Budget, 352
The war supply, 352
Ordinary revenue and expenditure, 353
Government's pre-election pledges, 354
Expenditures by departments, 355
Methods of meeting expenditures, 360
Buy-in-Canada propaganda, 360

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Falling imports and revenues, 360
Tariff taxation, 362
British preference, 364
Wool duty, 365
Cotton, 366
Bituminous coal, 366
Economy versus taxation, 367
Coast Guard, steamer, 1866
Controverted elections, 1923, 2012, 2148
Dominion elections
Hours of polling, 1903, 1916
Railway men, voting of, 1903
Voters' lists, 1896
Dominion lands, administration of, 232
Dominion notes issue, 1534, 1653
Dredge No. 7, 1866
Expenditures, public, 764, 1290
See Budget
Fish and fisheries
American vessels, regulation of, 1650
Modus vivendi licenses, 1275, 1277
Halifax and Eastern railway, 1466
Halifax
Chartered steamers, 1647
Customs night watchman, 831
Headquarters staff, 1514
Terminals, 764, 1688
Permanent force, 2529
House of Commons sessional employees, 2109
Humphrey Colonel, retirement of, 1514
Loans, Imperial Government, to Canada, 522
Longard, G. E., employment of, 831
Naval service, 1613
Niobe repairs, 151
Noreen, steamer, 1396, 2188
Petite Riviere fishery guardian, 1396
Privilege—newspaper misrepresentation, 688
Robinson, G., employment of, 831
Royal Print and Lithographing Company, payments to, 1864
Shubenacadie post office, 1866
Taxation
Insurance companies, 1184
Telegraphic messages, 1193
Trade and Commerce, 1292
Atlantic ports, 1299
Cuban trade, 1294
Tufts Cove dry dock, 1647
Tyrian, steamer, 1786
Wade, W. W., dismissal of, 1395
War
Appropriation, 1662, 1676
Expenditures—reference to Public Accounts Committee, 945
West Indian trade, 1295

Maclean, Mr. William F. (South York, Ont.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Parliamentary institutions and the war, 33
Menace to American democracy, 34
Evil of militarism, 35
Banking facilities in Canada, 1353
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1905
Food exports, government control of, 544
Nickel, exportation of, 3, 78
Railways
Capitalization, control of, 78, 285, 726, 744, 756
Bridges, construction of, in towns and cities, 78, 285, 1150
Taxation—insurance companies, 1181
Transportation, 261

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Budget, 789
Increased taxation and the farmers, 790
Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association resolutions, 792
Taxation of land values and income, 793
Objections to new tariff, 793
Customs valuation of agricultural implements, 605
Northwest coal leases, 1148
Peart, L., employment of, 308

McCoig, Mr. Archibald B. (West Kent, Ont.)
Budget, 622
Kent county mail service, 622
Tax on fertilizers, 623
Agricultural implements, 624
Horse raising, 625
Hog cholera, 627
Taxation
Fertilizers, 1162, 1164
Gravel and sand, 1163

McCraney, Mr. George E. (Saskatoon)
Aberdeen Association—franking privilege, 1370
Alexander divorce bill, 1894, 1987, 2187
Bank loans for seed grain, 1352
Controverted elections, 2027
Customs tariff
Articles exempt from increased duties, 246
Valuation for duty, 605
Nova Scotians in the west, 1560
Public works, expenditures on, 1971, 2035
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 47, 284, 1223
Rosthern customs, 79
Saskatoon
Customs collector, 79
Public building, 2043

McCraney, Mr. George E. (Saskatoon)—*Con.*
Rural mails, 607
Schrader grazing lease, 1560, 1562
Western farmers, relief for, 56

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Barachois wharf, 2185
Genest, A., employment of, 767, 1185, 1368
Live Stock Commissioner Giard, 2084
Pickel, G. H., employment of, 831
Horses for the war, 830
Sherbrooke mounted rifles, supplies for, 314, 1512

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Shelburne and Queens)
Intercolonial Railway—Sunnybrae branch, 1479, 1481
Nova Scotia military forces, 1503
War supplies—boots, 2419

McDonald, D. A., employment of, 1186, 1288

McInnes, T. R. E., employment of, 1864

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (North Cape Breton)
Alert, steamer, 223, 230, 1646
Behring sea fisheries claims, 239
Budget
Royal commissions, 975
Canada's share in the war, 976
Criticism of the Government, 977
The Government's financial administration, 978
National Transcontinental railway, 979
Canada's finances and the war, 981
Public works expenditure, 982
Controverted elections, 1922
Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 667, 948
Fenian raid bounty, 1546
Food exports, government control of, 545
French River breakwater, 2053
Gobeil, A., employment of, 1967
Grain trade, 1954
Ingonish
Fishermen, 350
Wharf, 2112
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 1481, 1491
North Cape Breton requirements, 1699
Trains, 166
McDonald, D A., employment of, 1186, 1288
Masters and mates, examination of, 340
North Cape Breton
Bonded warehouses, 1650
Customs service, 221, 225
Rented government buildings, 1288, 2049
Telegraph lines, 2180
North Sydney public building, 1981
Nova Scotia
Postal service, 902
Telegraph and telephone service, 2180

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (North Cape Breton)—*Con.*
Parliamentary representation of the Maritime provinces, 321
Printing Bureau—pay of women employees, 1593
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 665
Soldiers, votes for, 2273, 2358, 2485
Smuggling, alleged, in Cape Breton, 223
Sydney Mines public building, 1981
Taxation
Penalties, 1418
Stamp taxes, 1417
Witness, alleged improper detention of, 1555
Wrecking plants, 349

McLean, Mr. Angus A. (Queens, P.E.I.)
Experimental farms, poultry on, 2056
Charlottetown, car-building for, 1697
Marine life-saving stations, 1637
North Lake boat harbour, 2114
Prince Edward Island parliamentary representation, 324, 1462, 2331
San Francisco exposition, 2086
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 1224

McLean, Mr. H. H. (Sunbury and Queens)
Soldiers, votes for, 2256, 2259, 2268, 2276, 2472, 2487, 2535

McLeod, Col. H. F., command of, 561, 1441

McLeod, J. W., employment of, 896

McMillan, Mr. John A. (Glengarry)
Military training camps, 1456
Montreal—Carslake hotel purchase, 1289
War supplies—horses, 2100

McNeil, W., employment of, 1648

McQuarrie, Major, resignation of, 2528

Mail bag locks. *See* Post Office

Maple sugar. *See* Adulteration

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Baie des Chaleurs railway, 518
Bonaventure rural mail service, 769, 994, 2297
Boulton, E. A., employment of, 2121
Canada, steamer, stranding of, 344
Canadian Peat Society, 1865
Carleton, Que., retaining wall, 390
Civil Service
Commission, 992
Promotions, 1959
Controverted elections, 2017, 2030
Dagneau, John T., employment of, 1866
Demonstration farm for Gaspé or Bonaventure, 2068

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)—*Con.*

Dominion elections
Candidates having government contracts, 2143
Deferred elections, 1903, 2147
Drinking water, supervision of, 1600
Escuminac wharf, 1287
Farmers in Quebec, aid to, 291
Fish and Fisheries
Fisheries in tidal waters, 116, 994, 2302
Fishermen, grants to, 2123, 2300, 2301
French
Blue-books in
Printing and distribution, 1596, 2310
Translation, 504
War stamps in, 1205, 1412
French Canadian battalion, 22nd, 1149
Gaspé
Deferred elections in, 1903, 2147
Purchase of war supplies in, 994
Railways, 518
Salmon fisheries, 116, 2302
Steamer service, 307, 833, 1286, 1301
Gaspé bay anchorage, 998, 1449
Grain trade and flour prices, 1957
Immigration, 1572, 1575
Indians, Quebec, 1307
Inland Revenue Department, administration of, 1720, 1870
Insurance Department, 2372
Intercolonial railway
Lumber contracts, 768
Matapedia, subway for, 1698
Liquors, inspection of, 1158
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1794
Marine life-saving service, 350
Matapedia
Road, 1289, 2178
Water supply, 768
Montreal post office, 1377, 1986, 2296
New Carlisle, public building for, 1287, 1985
New Mills salmon pond, 2301
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2143
Paspebiac
Customs office, 633
Wharf, 633, 2161
Peat experiments, 2122
Port Daniel mail service, 1992
Postage stamps, sale of, on Sunday, 2297
Printing bureau, 1591
Quebec
Fisheries, 116, 994
Rural mail routes, 769
Superior court judges, 1186
Repatriation, 1571

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)—*Con.*

Restigouche river
Bridge, 1148, 1682, 2177
Dredging, 1289, 1648, 2172
St. Jean l'Evangeliste mail service, 833
Scoles, C. R., payments to, 1468
Soldiers, votes for, 2264, 2268, 2344, 2485, 2516, 2538
Taxation—telegraphic messages, 1406
War supplies, purchase of, 994

Marcile, Mr. Joseph E. (Bagot)

Bagot county postal service, 141
Budget, 1052
British navy and the war, 1053
Government's financial methods, 1055
The new taxation, 1056
German spy, suspected, arrest of, 610
Valcartier camp supplies, 149
War supplies
Boots, 149
Horses, 315

Marine

British ships, transfer of, 990, 1057
Coasting trade, 296
Department
Estimates, 338-350, 1250-1270
Staff and salaries, 237
Earl Grey, sale of the, 312, 339, 1255
Empress of Ireland investigation, 339, 343
Hydrographic surveys, 1626
Ice-breaking, 339, 1255, 1267
Life-saving, 350, 1633, 1638
Lighthouse and coast service, 1256-1260, 1267, 2304
Maritime road, 1267
Masters and mates, examination of, 340
Navigation
Aids, 1258
Hudson Bay, 1628
Obstructions, removal of, 347, 2303
Rates, inland, control of, 43, 249
St. Lawrence, 1057, 1252
Schools, 346
Pilotage, 1265
Seamen, wrecked and distressed, 1269
Shipping casualties in 1914, 833
Signal service, 1264
Steamboat inspection, 1270
Steamers, government, 312, 338, 1255
Steamship services. *See that title*
Unseaworthy vessels, 345
Wrecking plants, subsidies for, 349
Wrecks, investigations into, 342

Martin, Mr. Mederic (Montreal, St. Mary's)

Maisonneuve leased post office, 2050
Unemployment, 501, 2320

Martin, Mr. William M. (Regina)
Aberdeen Association—franking privilege 311
Advertising and printing, payments by Government for, 761
Anderson, T. A., employment of, 605, 761, 996
Bank loans for seed grain, 1355
Carey, J. M., employment of, 993
Coal royalties, 520
Davidson, W. W., employment of, 768
Duck Mountain timber reserve, 992, 1577
Food exports, government control of, 539
Gallon, W. J., employment of, 831
Gillis, A. B., employment of, 831
Homestead inspectors, superfluous, 231
Homesteads and pre-emptions, statistics of, 996
Horses, fraudulent importation of, 229
Hudson Bay railway, 1148
Immigration, 1147, 1570, 1572
Indians—St. Peter's reserve, 13, 19, 1888
Inland navigation rates, control of, 253
Inland Revenue frauds, 512
Interior Department, administration of, 231 1570
Judges in active militia, 1728
Last Mountain lake dredging, 311
Maple Creek land office officials, 997
Militia separation allowances, 688
Real estate titles, fraudulent, 1225
Regina
Mounted police quarters, 311
Property purchases by Department of Public Works, 762
Customs ports, 228
Regina-Moosejaw
Water supply, 311
Riding Mountain timber reserve, 1577
Sabistons—half-breed scrip, 1287
Saskatchewan lands, Indian and school, sales of, 768
Saskatchewan river water power, 235
Saskatoon land office officials, 997
Soldiers, insurance, 390
Swift Current land office officials, 997
Taxation—agricultural implements, 1169-1172
Western farmers, relief for, 49, 632, 720, 768, 1150, 1329, 1342, 1355

Masters and Mates. *See* Marine.

Matapedia
Road, 1289, 2178
Water supply, 768

Mattatall Lake post office, 832

Medical Council of Canada, grant to, 1251, 2316

Medicine Hat
Homestead inspector, 2123
Postmasters, 764
Rural mail service, 768

Megantic county postmasters, 609

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Solicitor General)
Budget, 1115
The Opposition's criticism, 1116
War taxes, 1117
Diminished revenues, 1118
Retrenchment of expenditure, 1119
Industrial protection, 1122
Aid to railways, 1125
Taxation for revenue, 1127
Land tax and income tax, 1129
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2573
Grain trade, 1955, 2030, 2193
National Transcontinental railway—proposed government operation, 1823, 1838
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 653
Soldiers, votes for, 2220, 2347
Solicitor General, office of, 1737
Western farmers, relief for, 68, 1332

Menace newspaper, 991

Merner, Mr. J. J. (South Huron)
Food exports, government control of, 536

Meteorological service, 1268

Metric system, 1785

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Victoria, N.B.)
Edmundston post office, 1390
Herrings, exported, price of, 1786
Horn extradition case, 44, 79
Indians, New Brunswick, 1319
Intercolonial railway
Freight rates in New Brunswick, 165
Mail service, 1390
International railway service, 1470
Metric system, 1785
Oil for fuel, 294
Stamp taxes, 1210
War supplies—horses, 246

Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Boots, army—report of special committee 2372

Middlesex county Indians, 518

Military stores, fraud in sale of, 205, 304, 476, 1226

Militia and Defence
British Columbia militiamen in active service, 151
Cadet corps, 1518
Civil servants in militia service, 312, 522

Militia and Defence—*Con.*

Department
Coal supply, 2319, 2326
Estimates, 1428, 1496, 1544, 2319
Dominion arsenal, 1506
Drill halls, 2035
Duties on imported munitions, 1506
Engineer service and works, 1513
Fair wages clause in contracts, 240, 391
Motor trucks, 1145
Officers' allowances, 1447
Permanent force, 1515, 2529
Petawawa camp, 240, 1185
Railway engineering corps, 1525
Rifle ranges, 1553
Royal Military College, 1519
Schools of instruction, 1524
Training areas, 1556
Valcartier camp, 240, 391, 1514, 1552, 2122, 2123
See War

Mines and Minerals
Coal
Imports, 244, 521, 633, 828
Leases, 1148, 1611
Royalties, 520
Western industry, 492
Department
Estimates, 1599, 2313
Staff and salaries, 1599
Electric smelting, 1602, 2313
Explosives, 1601, 1604
Geological survey, 1606-1611
Investigations and experiments, 1603, 2313
Oil. *See that title*
Peat
Canadian Peat Society, 1865
Experiments, 2122
Radium-bearing ores, 1609
Tar sands for road making, 1604

Ministerial changes, 207

Mizonnette lighthouse, 46

Molloy, Mr. John P. (Provencher)
Fournier, L. H., employment of, 521
Hudson Bay railway bridge, 606
Winnipeg
Resident engineer, 765
Volunteers, 313

Moncton. *See* Intercolonial railway

Montmagny, wreck of, 1867

Montreal
Armoury—fair wage clause, 240
Barracks, 2035
Carslake hotel purchase, 1289, 2528. *See also* Postal Station A
Dismissals of public works employees, 1652

Montreal—*Con.*

Postal station A, 1651, 1986, 2186, 2528
Postal Station L, 2528
Post office, 1377
Resident engineer, 437

Monuments, erection of, 1251, 1252

Moosejaw
Property purchases by Department of Public Works, 762
Water supply, 311

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Compensation to workmen by railways, 514
Controverted elections, 2003
Real estate, fraudulent titles to, 1225

Morris, F., employment of, 151

Morris, Mr. James (Chateauguay)
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1794

Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 1249, 1284, 2322, 2326

Mousseau, P A., employment of, 1992, 2122

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Canadian Northern railway, payments to, 150
Canadian patriotic fund, 143
Canadian War Contingent Association, 2122
Dominion Trust Company, 519
Fort Erie shooting case, 143
French river improvements, 1991
Hall, R. P., appointment of, 763
Immigration officials, suspension of, 243
Marriage laws, 436
North Bay recruiting, 1991
Nottar, H., death of, 150
Ottawa and Hull town-planning commission, 241
Overseas dominions, status of, 439
Pollution of navigable waters, 123
Princess Patricia regiment, 391
Soldiers, votes for, 2204, 2470
Valcartier camp—payment of accounts, 312
Victoria Memorial Museum, 153
War supplies
Boots, 2395
Canvas shoes, 763
Horses, 149, 314, 520
Overshoes, 315
Saddles, 632

National Drug Company, 312

National Gallery of Canada, 2182

National Transcontinental railway
Bridge keepers, 897
Construction, 1859

National Transcontinental Railway—*Con.*
Government Operation Bill. Res., 1802. 1r., 1859. 2r., 1894. Com., 2124. 3r., 2139, 2195
Investigating commission, expenses of, 44
Montreal connection, 1711
Portneuf claims, 993
Quebec
Bridge, expenditure on, 437, 1864
Terminals, 518, 606, 993, 1867
Station employees, 1143

Naturalization, 610, 1598, 2317

Naval Service
Department
Estimates, 237, 1612-1621, 2298
Staff and salaries, 237
Forces and expenses, 1613, 1614, 1654
Northern waters, patrol of, 1630, 2298
Stefansson expedition, 1630, 2298

Navigable waters
Pollution of, 3, 118, 204
Removal of obstructions in, 347

Navigation. *See* Marine

Neely, Mr. D. B. (Humboldt)
Budget
Commercial depression, 959
Trade policy of the Government, 960
Decreased trade and revenues and the war, 961
The tariff increases, 962
Manufacturers and consumers, 963
The made-in-Canada movement, 963
Methods of increasing revenues, 964
Taxation of British imports, 965, 969
National Transcontinental railway, 966
Canadian Northern railway, 968
Hudson Bay railway, 969
Opposition alternative proposals, 970
German population of the west, 970
Live stock industry, 2094
War supplies—horses, 388, 2095, 2098
Western farmers, relief for, 61
Wood, E. C., land patent of, 151

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward W. (North Oxford)
Budget
Hard times and the war, 593
Problems of the Minister of Finance, 594
Taxation of loan and insurance companies, 595
The new tariff, 595
Reduction of expenditures, 596
Soldiers, votes for, 2283, 2480
Taxation—insurance companies, 595, 1180, 1183
War supplies—boots, 2414

New Brunswick steamship services, 1301, 1304

New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, purchase of, 152

New Carlisle, public building for, 1287, 1985

Newcastle wireless station—alleged flying of American flag, 1616

Newfoundland
Partridge berries from, 1166
Steamship services, 1295, 1301, 1303

New Glasgow
Dredging, 1992
Mail service, 517

New Waterford
Mail service, 1360
Recruiting, 392

Nickel Export Regulation Bill. 1r., 3. Ruled out, 43. *See* 78, 1937

Nickle, Mr. William F. (Kingston)
Canadian patriotic fund, 401
Kingston penitentiary commission, 1767
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 655
Soldiers, votes for, 2244

Niobe and Rainbow, His Majesty's Canadian ships, 45, 151

Noreen, steamer, 1396, 2188

Northern waters, patrol of, 1630, 2298

Northrup, Mr. William B. (East Hastings)
Vancouver Terminal Railway Company, 990

Nottar, H., shooting of, 150

Nova Scotia
Coal areas, 1609
Electoral lists, 833
Military forces, 481, 561, 608, 612, 687, 720, 905, 1396, 1428, 1496
Postal service, 900, 1380
Public works. *See that title*
Steamship services, 1301, 1304

Nova Scotians in the west, 1559

Oil
Fuel, 143, 294
Leases, 241, 243

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)
Alberta
Military training area, 1556
Public buildings, 2044
Animals, diseases of, 2089
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1960
Athabaska Landing public building, 2044, 2298

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)—*Con.*
Athabaska river dredging, 2775
Banff and Calgary civil servants, 1184
British Columbia public buildings, 2045
Budget, 378
An extraordinary budget, 378
The financial situation, 379
War loans, 380
Means for increasing revenue, 381
Tariff increases, 383
Western agricultural production, 386
Canada Year Book, 1938
Canadian expeditionary forces, 2370
Canadian patriotic fund, 395
Coal, sub-bituminous, 1604
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 705
Edmonton
Public buildings, 2044
Rifle range, 1553
River bank, protection of, 2169
Explosives in mines, 1606
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2539, 2601
Grain trade, 1951, 2030, 2191
Homestead maps, 237
Homesteaders' wood rights, 1566
Hudson Bay
Navigation, 1627, 1629
Railway, 1861
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 1892
Kootenay bay wharf, 2171
Lethbridge immigration inspector, 1569
National Transcontinental railway—proposed government operation, 1850, 2136
National parks, Canadian, 236
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2145
Pigeon lake improvements, 2168
Prince George mail service, 2298
Printing Bureau and public printing, 1597
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 1876
Saskatchewan and Alberta government telegraph lines, 2179
Senate, powers of the, 2330
Soldiers, votes for, 2240, 2271, 2292, 2344, 2356, 2463, 2476, 2495, 2504, 2533
Stefansson expedition, 310, 1630, 1632, 2300
Sturgeon river improvements, 2170
Tar sands, 1605
Timber regulations, 1566
Valcartier camp, 1552
War
Appropriation, 1677
Pensions, 141
Supplies—horses, 766, 1867, 2102
Water-power investigations, 235
Weights and measures, inspection of, 511
Western farmers, relief for, 66

Ottawa
Buildings rented by Government, 148, 308, 2047
Dominion buildings, 1968, 2037
Victoria Memorial Museum, 153, 1969
Woods and Canadian buildings—cost of electric lighting, 1651

Ottawa and Hull
Postal rate, 766
Town-planning commission, 241, 766

Ottawa river storage works, 2181

Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T. (Megantic)
Megantic postmasters, 609

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Charge of corruption, 1144
Civil service, increase of, 1588

Paquet, Mr. Eugene (L'Islet)
Budget, 971
Nature of the war, 971
Patriotism and production, 972
The public expenditures, 973
The war taxes, 974

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Civil service—dismissals and appointments, 218
Controverted elections, 1995, 2153
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 1913
Drill halls, expenditures on, 2035
Gobeil, A., employment of, 1964
Philadelphia immigration agent, 522
Motor trucks for Militia Department, 1145
Taxation—gravel and sand, 1160, 1163, 1164
Wrecks, investigations into, 343

Parks, Canadian national, 236

Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 1242, 1901, 2140

Parliamentary procedure
Bill, re-committal of, with instructions, 2195
Divorce bills, on, 1987, 2187
Member, having begun speech, temporarily yields floor to intervening speaker, by consent of House, 999
Previous debate, reference by members to, 1765
Printing of parliamentary documents, rule for, 1057
Private Bills—suspension of certain rules, 1527
Resolution
Affecting postage submitted by private member, 338
Moved after notice, 1159
See Speaker

Parliamentary representation
British North America Act, proposed amendment of—address to the King, 1459, 2327
House of Commons Representation Act of 1914, correction of clerical errors in, 1557, 1994
See Prince Edward Island

Paspebiac
Customs office, 633
Wharf, 633

Patent medicines
Composition of, 1717
Tax on, 1208, 1423

Patent shovel shield, 437, 1235

Patents, renewal of, 1261, 1284, 1989

Patriotic fund. *See* Canadian

Peace
Canadian Centenary Association, 2815
Terms of, and the overseas Dominions, 2627

Peart, L., employment of, 308

Peat. *See* Mines

Pecuniary Claims Convention, 1740

Pelletier, Hon. L. P.
Testimonial to, 211
Trip of, 2529

Penitentiaries
Begg, Mr., employment of, 828
Kingston, 136, 271, 515, 1740
Prison reform, 1049, 1761, 1775
Release of Thomas Riley, 2459
Stony Mountain, 390, 1185
Tickets of leave, 1736

Pensions, 1188, 1394, 1450

Perley, Sir George H.
Acting Canadian High Commissioner, 2318
Speech of—status of Overseas Dominions, 439

Peterborough, government employees in, 1285

Petite Rivière fishery guardian, 1396

Pettet, W. V., employment of, 2123

Phillips-Wolley, Sir Clive, appointment of, 151

Philipsburg-St. Armand mail service, 249, 313, 995

Pickel, G. H., employment of, 831

Picton armoury, 1145

Pictou (county)
Fishery guardians, 245
Mail service, 244, 610, 995, 1288, 1458, 2123, 2188
Medical examiners for volunteers, 762

Pictou (island) telephone line, 143

Pictou (town) winter freight handling, 246

Pilotage. *See* Marine

Pit props, trade in, 1934

Pollution of Navigable Waters Bill. 1r., 3. 2r., 118. Ref. to special Com., 204.

Pope lease on Knee Hill Creek, 993

Port Arthur
Drill hall, 2038
Harbour improvements, 1970-1975

Port Daniel mail service, 1992

Post Office
Closed offices, 833
Contingencies, 1360
Department staff and salaries, 1359, 2295
Dismissals, 1363
Estimates, 1359-1394, 2295-2298
Franking privilege, 311, 905, 1370, 2296
Free postage for soldiers, 338, 1419
Mail carriers, payment of, 2297
Mail bag locks, 46, 1393
Motor cars, 1391
Outside service, 1360, 1371
Parcel post, 1371-1375, 1384
Post cards, stamps on, 1205
Rural mail service, 1379, 1384
Stamps, sale and use of, 1391, 1393, 1422, 2297, 2624

Potatoes. *See* Agriculture.

Power, Mr. William (Quebec West)
Salisbury camp, 1504

Prince Albert property purchase, 762

Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 1704
Immigration officer, 1575
Mail service, 1378, 1385
Marine life-saving service, 1637
Parliamentary representation, 316, 1459, 2327, 2331
Public works, 2114
Railway, 1704, 1707
Steamship services, 1303
Winter mail service, 348

Prince of Wales fund, 244

Prince Rupert Rifles, disbandment of, 1522

Printing Bureau, Government, 1591-1597, 2307

Prison reform. *See* Penitentiaries

Private Bills discussed
Alexander, Charles Isaac, divorce bill, 1894, 1987, 2187
Canadian Northern Railway Company, 708, 758
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, 560
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 725
Casualty Company of Canada, 761
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 705, 721
Lohmann Company, patent of, 1261, 1284
Millen, J., patent of, 1989
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company, 966
Toronto Eastern Railway Company, 708
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company, 967
Van Buren Bridge Company, 709, 760
Vancouver Terminal Railway Company, 990, 1262

Prostitution, houses of, 1227

Proulx, Mr Edmond (Prescott)
Aliens at Petawawa, 828, 998
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1958, 1961
Dominion elections—candidates and government contracts. *See* Parliament.
Dredge No. 7, 1647
French Canadians and the war, 1442
Furniture for government offices, 1868
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 1145
Hawkesbury-Grenville bridge, 1648, 1992, 2176
Home militia, 312, 522
Judges' pensions, 765
L'Orignal post office, 1363
Minister of Militia and the war, 1517
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 1242, 1527, 1901, 1929, 2140-2146
Petawawa camp, 1185
Picton armoury, 1145
Privilege—Ottawa Evening Journal, 991
Soldiers, votes for, 2291
Taxation—income, 1197
Telephones, free, for government officials, 1970
War supplies, purchase of
Horses, 994
Housewives, 1650
Oats and hay, 1397

Public Accounts Committee. *See* War supplies—investigations

Public health, conservation of, 2107

Public works
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1958, 1961, 1966, 2184
Buildings
Alberta, 2044
British Columbia, 2045
Manitoba, 2040
New Brunswick, 1981
Nova Scotia, 1975
Ontario, 2034, 2185
Quebec, 1983
Saskatchewan, 2042
Department
Engineering branch, 2181
Estimates, 1958, 1961, 2034, 2111, 2155
Dredging
Dredge No. 7, 1647, 1866
Maritime provinces, 1289, 1648, 1992, 2171
Ontario and Quebec, 1252, 2172
Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2175
Expenditures, 2035
Harbours and rivers
British Columbia, 1970, 2170
Generally, 2155
Manitoba, 2166
New Brunswick, 1972, 2117
Nova Scotia, 2051, 2111
Ontario, 1970, 1975, 2164, 2184
Prince Edward Island, 1975, 2114
Quebec, 1971, 2119, 2155, 2185
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2167
Slides and booms, 2184

Pugsley, Hon. William (St. John City)
Allison, J. Wesley, services, of, 1451, 1506
Amherst post office site, 1975
Ammunition, purchases of, 1451, 1506
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1960
Bank loans for seed grain, 1244
Budget, 470, 562
Proposed taxation, 470, 563
Civil Service—statement of Mr. Adam Shortt, 471
Public works expenditures, 473, 564
Militia expenditures, 564
Stamp taxes, 569, 573
Coal tariff, 570
Farmers and the tariff, 570, 575
Duty on fertilizers, 571
French treaty imports, 573
British preference, 576
Canadian Pacific railway steamship services, 738
Censorship, 1448, 1496, 1506

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)—*Con.*
Civil Service
Appointments, 1873
War service, government employees on, 217
See Shortt
Controverted elections, 1922, 1997, 2008, 2017, 2151
Cost of Living Commission, 2625
Dominion elections—candidates and government contracts, 2140
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 722
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2584
Inland Revenue, pamphlet of Deputy Minister of, 1725
International railway, government acquisition of, 1682
Leonardsville dredging, 312
Lobsters, sale of undersized, 1150
McLeod, Colonel H. F., battalion of, 561
Medical Council of Canada, 1251
Militia Department coal supply, 2319
National Transcontinental railway, 1829, 2130
Ottawa—buildings rented by Government, 2047
Palmerston public building, 2037
Parliament, members of, and government contracts, 2140, 2146
Parliamentary representation, 1461, 2333
Patent ballot, allowance for, 1591
Printing, government, 1595
Privilege—omission in Hansard, 689
Public works expenditures, 1362. *See* Budget
Railway employees, voting of, 2503
Real estate, fraudulent titles to, 1219
St. John
Custom house improvements, 1982
Harbour improvements, 1972
Secretary of State, Department of, expenditure of, 1590
Seed grain. *See* Western farmers
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 213, 471, 647
Soldiers, votes for, 2226, 2353, 2463, 2477, 2490, 2503, 2538
Submarines, purchase of, 94, 110, 946
Taxation
Banks, 1195
Corporations, 1195
Fertilizers, 571, 1159, 1395, 1400, 1402
French Treaty, articles under, 573, 1212, 1216
Insurance companies, 1179
Postal rates and stamp taxes, 1419
Proprietary or patent medicines, 1425
Spirits, 1155
Telegraphic messages, 1194
See Budget

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)—*Con.*
Transatlantic steamship services, 1298
Vancouver immigration building, 2046
War
Appropriations, 91
Supplies
Agents, 40, 2461. *See* Allison
Ammunition 1451, 1507, 1669
Bicycles, 767
British Government, 2461
Horses, 1230-1232
Western farmers, relief for, 1329. *See* Bank loans

Qu'Appelle postmastership, 436

Quebec (city)
Bridge, 437, 1710
Harbour Commissioners, 2123
Price, Sir William, resignation of, 1965, 1966
Harbour improvements, 1971
History of port, 1962
Postal revenues, 896
Terminals, 1860

Quebec (county) telegraph service, 1187, 2122

Quebec (province)
Aid to farmers, 291
Fisheries, 116, 994, 2302
Steamship services, 1301
Superior court judges, superannuation of, 1186

Quebec and Saguenay railway, 2532, 2625

Radium. *See* Mines

Railways
Capitalization, control of, 78, 261, 285, 726-758, 1150
Employees, voting of, 2498
Extension of charters, 706, 720, 758
Labour conditions on construction work, 502
Mail contracts, 1375
Wages, payment of, on, 498
Workmen's compensation, 514
For individual railways, see their titles

Railways and Canals Department
Estimates, 1467-1495, 1685-1713, 1859-1863
Staff and salaries, 1471

Rainville, Mr. Joseph H. (Chambly and Vercheres)
War supplies—boots, 2408

Real estate titles, fraudulent, 47, 284, 476, 1219

Regina
Mounted police quarters, 311
Property purchases by Government, 762 2188
Water supply, 311

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs)
Agriculture
Department estimates, 1229-1240
Farmers' relief, 1239
Potato embargo, 719, 749, 991, 1229
Civil Service—stenographers, 1472
Customs
Agricultural implements, valuation of, 605, 1170
Alert, revenue steamer, 23
Department
Appointments and dismissals, 218, 228
Employees on war service, 217-219
Estimates, 217-230
Staff and salaries, 217-230
Investigations, 611
Smuggling, alleged, 223
Spirits, valuation of, 1155
Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 952
Fraudulent importation of horses, 230
Patent shovel shield, 1236
Patents, renewal of, 1261, 1284, 1990
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 662
Toronto custom house, 2039
War supplies—horses, 1230-1235

Reindeer, experiments with, 234, 2315

Repatriation, 1571

Restigouche river
Bridge, 1148, 2177
Dredging, 1289, 1648

Rhoda, steamer, 2531

Rhodes, Mr. Edgar N. (Cumberland)
Amherst
Armoury, 1977
Car-building, 1696
Post office, 1975
Cumberland mail service, 1649
Intercolonial railway—Wallace spur line, 1694
Nova Scotia military forces, 1496, 1501, 1551

Ribstone, village of, patent of, 243

Richard, Mrs. Margaret, claim of, 896, 1639

Richards, J. W., M.P., death of, 827

Richelieu county mail carriers, 1287

Richelieu river wharves, 995

Richmond county, Quebec, farmers, relief for, 1238

Riding mountain timber reserve, 1577

Rigaud
Armoury, 631, 993
Dredging, 390
Wharf, 1786

Rimouski (county)
Dredging, 897
Purchase of war supplies in, 994

River John customs sub-collectorship, 142

Robb, Mr. James A. (Huntingdon)
Corn imports, 152
Drill halls, 2035
Flour, Canada's gift of, to Great Britain, 1646
Grain trade, 1346, 2032, 2192
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1792
Rural mail service, 1384
Seed grain, purchase and distribution of, 1346
Taxation—Customs valuations, 1403, 1405
War supplies—horses, 249, 1232, 2099

Robertson, Struan, Lt.-Col. *See* Nova Scotia military forces

Robinson, George, employment of, 831

Roche, Hon. W. J. (Minister of the Interior)
Astronomical observatory, western, 1585, 1893
Duck mountain timber reserve, 1578
Forest reserves, 1578
Homestead maps, 237
Homesteaders' wood rights, 1565
Immigration, 1558, 1569-1577
Agencies, 1558, 1564
Oriental, 1576
Indians, 1306-1328. *See that title*
Interior Department
Estimates, 231, 1281, 1558
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2551
Staff, salaries, etc., 233, 1558, 1570
Irrigation—refund, 1894
Lethbridge immigration officer, 1568
Nova Scotians in the west, 1559
Parks, Canadian national, 236, 1894
Schrader grazing lease, 1564
Seed grain. *See* Western farmers
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 232
Timber protection, 233, 1565, 1578
Tree culture, 233
Water-powers, development of, 234
Western farmers, relief for, 53, 292, 948, 1281, 1329, 1344, 1348
Wetaskawin settlers, grievances of, 1561
Yukon placer mining rights, 514, 1868

Rogers, Hon. Robert (Minister of Public Works)
Architect, Dominion chief, appointment of, 1958, 1968, 2184
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company, 705, 720
Gobeil, A., employment of, 1962-1968
House of Commons—business of the House, 1787
Militia Department coal supply, 2326
National Transcontinental railway—government operation, 1857
Public works
Buildings, 1961, 1975, 2034, 2185
Department
Estimates, 1958, 1961, 2034, 2111, 2155
Staff, salaries, etc., 1958, 2184
Dredging, 2171
Harbours and rivers, 1970, 2051, 2111, 2155
Miscellaneous, 2181
Roads and bridges, 2176
Slides and booms, 2184
Telegraph lines, 2179
Seed grain. *See* Western farmers
Senate, powers of the, 2328
Shortt, Mr Adam, speech of, 471, 636
Telephones, free, for government officials, 1970
Victoria Memorial Museum, 1969
Votes for soldiers, 336
Western farmers, relief for, 62

Ross, Mr. Duncan C. (West Middlesex)
Foot and mouth disease, 611, 2053, 2087
Middlesex county Indians, 518

Rosthern customs receipts, 79

Royal assent, 2210, 2628

Royal Print and Lithograph Company, payments to, 1864

Royal Society of Canada, accommodation for, 245

Roy, Col. Alex., retirement of, 1516

Roy, F. X., employment of, 992

St. Anselme government employees, 1993

St. Antoine de Richelieu wharf, 995

St. Armand rural mail service, 1289

St. Denis rural mail service, 993

St. Gilbert de Portneuf postmaster, 307

St. Jean l'Evangeliste mail service, 833

St. John, N.B.
Custom house improvements, 1982
Harbour, 1972

St. John Valley railway, 46, 142, 173

St. Lambert post office, 1648

St. Lawrence. *See* Marine

St. Mathieu dredging, 2173

St. Paul's Island life-saving station, 608

St. Peter's Indian reserve. *See* Indians

St. Romuald post office, 518

St. Thomas armoury, 1866

St. Zotique wharf, 390

Sackville
Home guard, 1517, 1706
Pilotage, 1266
Post office, 153
Railway accommodation, 606, 1693

Saskatchewan
Homesteads and pre-emptions, 996
Indian lands, 768
Land office officials, 997
School lands, 768

Saskatoon
Customs collector, 79
Public building, 2043, 2326
Public Works Department property purchases, 762
Rural mail service, 607

Schaffner, Mr. F. L. (Souris)
Bank loans for seed grain, 1355
Boissevain postmastership, 1369
Capital punishment, 136
Experimental farms, 2058, 2064
Food exports, government control of, 531
Freight rates, 258
Taxation—proprietary medicines, 1208, 1211

Schrader grazing lease, 1562

Scientific literature, international catalogue of, 1590

Scott, Mr F. S. (South Waterloo)
Budget, 590
The late Mr. Clare, M.P., 590
Taxation of banks, 590
British preference, 591
Government railway expenditures, 591
The made-in-Canada movement, 592
Canada's opportunities, 592

Secretary of State, Department of
Estimates, 1588, 2307
Staff, salaries, etc., 1588, 1589

Seed grain, distribution of. *See* Western Farmers *and* Richmond County

Seguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption)
L'Assomption (county), public employees from, 2528
L'Assomption (village) wharf, 1145, 2119
St. Lin public building, 1984

Senate. *See* Parliamentary representation *and* Senate and House of Commons

Senate and House of Commons Act Amendment Bills
Independence of members. 1r., 1242
Members on active service. 1r., 351. 2r., 439. Com., 439. 3r., 441

Sharpe, Mr. Samuel (North Ontario)
Bank loans for seed grain, 1352
Canadian Pacific Railway Company's ocean services, 741, 757
Canadian patriotic fund, 1864
Ottawa—Woods and Canadian buildings—cost of electric lighting, 1651
War supplies
Horses, 829
Ammunition, 1652

Sharpe, Mr. Wm. H. (Lisgar)
Binders, imports of, 1649
Food exports, government control of, 547
Grain trade, 1954
Hudson Bay navigation, 1629

Shefford county rural mail service, 1287

Shelburne
Fishery inspector, 1271
Fog alarm, 389

Sherbrooke Mounted Rifles, supplies for, 314, 1512

Shipping. *See* Marine

Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 213, 232, 471, 634

Shovel shield, 437, 1235

Shubenacadie post office, 1866

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)
Aliens, registration of, 48
Amherst
Custom house, 1646
Post office, 1396
Belgian relief, 1676
Budget, 889, 905
The party truce, 889
Canada's financial problem, 890
War expenditures, 891
Imperialism and nationalism, 891
Canada's period of hard times, 892
The Government's financial administration, 893
Political patronage and war contracts, 906

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
The new taxation, 909
Fishermen and the tariff, 910
Naval policy, 911
The member for West Peterborough, 911
Summing up, 912
Canning public building, 1979
Canso
Lobster hatchery, 2530
Military guard, 1556
Reduction works, 633, 767
Cole Harbour wharf, 517, 2051
Copper exports, 312
Country Harbour
Gas buoy, 762
Wharf, 2114
Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 604
East Erinville post office, 519
Fenian raid bounty, 1651
Fish and Fisheries
American vessels, regulation of, 1650
"Fish and How to Cook It"—booklet, 239
Lobsters
Close season, 45
Hatcheries, 2530
Pickled fish, inspection of, 48
Shell-fish Commission, 607
Steam trawling, 243, 311, 312, 1623, 1625, 2306
Transportation, 80
Guysborough
Branch railways. *See* Intercolonial
Fishery guardians, 313
Mail service, 519, 607, 633, 897, 1185
Halifax public works expenditures, 1458
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, eastern Nova Scotia, 44, 519, 1467, 1480, 1700
Fish transportation, 80
Ice contracts, 311
Imported stationery, 1697
Mulgrave car ferry, 1693
Pugwash spur line, 391
Wallace spur line, 391, 1694
Isaac's Harbour lobster hatchery, 2530
Le Blanc, seaman, family of, 896, 1639
Marine
Canadian shipping registry, 45
Coasting trade, 296, 1933
Shipping casualties in 1914, 833
Mattatall lake post office, 832
Military stores, fraud in sale of, 205, 304
National Transcontinental railway investigating commission, 44
Naval Service, Department of, 238
New Harbour breakwater, 2051
Niobe and Rainbow, Canadian ships, 45

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)—*Con.*
Nova Scotia
Electoral lists, 833
Military forces, 1438, 1502, 1550
Ocean freight rates, 216
Phillips-Wolley, Sir Clive, appointment of, 151
Pit props, trade in, 1934
Post offices closed in Canada, 833
Printing, government, 2308
Public works, expenditures on, 2039, 2047
Richard, Mrs. Margaret, claim of, 896, 1639
Shortt, Mr Adam, speech of, 639
Soldiers
Cerebro-spinal meningitis among, 2529
Votes for, 2263, 2268, 2345
Taxation
Letters and post cards, 1413
Patent medicines, 1424
War supplies—boots, 48

Soldiers. *See* Militia *and* War

Soldiers Voting Bill. 1r., 1874. 2r., 2195. Com., 2258, 2343, 2462, 2533. 3r., 2538. Senate amdts., 2625. *See* 334, 1643

Solicitor General, office of, 1735

Soulanges canal, 1712

Southampton railway investigation, 142

South Wellington mine disaster, 207

Speaker (Hon. T. S. Sproule), rulings and statements of
Bills
To be introduced by resolution:
To increase salaries, 1644
To regulate exports, 4, 43
Questions as to details irregular on 2r., 2201
Motion for ref. to com. only after 2r., 262
House not to instruct on Bill in possession of com., 387
Private bills—suspension of certain rules, 1527
Re-committal, with instructions, 2195
Blue books, printing and distribution of, 1596, 2311
Committees, power of, to administer the oath, 304, 306
House of Commons
Reading room, 611, 1863
Sessional employees, 2109
Irrelevancy, 1049
Members, irregular references to each other, 577
Patent medicines, sale of, 1718

Speaker (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—*Con.*
Printing of parliamentary documents, rule for, 1057
Privilege, questions of
Newspaper articles not such, 991, 2460
Political pamphlet, statements in, not such, 2190
Question containing unadmitted allegation of fact, also referring to unofficial matter, irregular, 2532
Report from Com. of Supply not receivable on day resolutions have been agreed to by Com., 2323
Resolution affecting postage not movable by private member, 338
Voters' lists, preparation of, 1594
See Parliamentary procedure

Special War Revenue Bill. Res., 87, 1175, 1191. 1r., 1217. 2r., 1405. Com., 1405, 1586. 3r., 1588. *See* Budget *and* Taxation

Squid imports, 244

Stamp taxes. *See* Taxation

Stanbridge East rural mail service, 995

Stanfield, Mr. John (Colchester)
House of Commons
Members and government contracts, 2142
Sessional indemnity, 2310

Stanfold township, model farm for, 1993

Steamboats. *See* Marine

Steamship services
Australia and New Zealand, 1292, 1300
Canada
British Columbia, 1300
Gaspé, 1301
New Brunswick, 1301, 1304
Nova Scotia, 1301, 1304
Prince Edward Island, 1303
Quebec, 1301
China and Japan, 1300
Cuba, 1294
France, 718
Great Britain, 1291, 1293, 1297
Newfoundland, 1295, 1301, 1303
South Africa, 1295
West Indies and South America, 1295

Stefansson expedition, 310, 1630, 2298

Stellarton public building, 763

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver)
Budget, 599, 613
Expenditures on public works, 600, 616
Estimates for the year, 603

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Financial and trade conditions and the war, 613, 617, 620
French treaty rights, 614
The new taxation, 615
Canada's foreign trade opportunities, 617
House of Commons—members' franking privilege and war stamps, 905
Kitsilano Indians, 1892
Militia Department coal supply, 2319
National labour bureau, 607
Vancouver Terminal Railway Company, 990

Submarines, 94, 107, 946, 955

Suckling, Rev. W. T., enlistment of, 1867

Supply, Committee of, 212-240, 338-351, 481-514, 1228-1242, 1249-1283, 1291-1328, 1359-1394, 1428-1458, 1466-1525, 1544-1585, 1588-1643, 1685-1714, 1715-1783, 1859-1863, 1876-1894, 1930-1987, 2034-2053, 2055-2121, 2154-2186, 2295-2320. *For details see titles of departments and subjects.*

Supply Bill (for 1915, $14,766,499.39; for 1916, $156,496,333.73). Res., 2371. 1r., 2r., Com., and 3r., 2372.

Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1988. 2r., 2053. Com., 2053. 3r., 2055.

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Budget, 878
Made-in-Canada movement, 878
Protection and the reciprocity pact, 879
The political truce, 880
Naval policy, 880, 887
Opposition criticisms, 883
War taxation, 885
British preference, 886
Experimental farms, 2069
Food exports, government control of, 548
Horse breeding, 2106
Meat inspection, 2091
Soldiers, votes for, 2285

Sydney-St. Peter's railway, proposed, 608, 992

Tar sands. *See* Mines

Tariff. *See* Taxation

Taxation, War
Customs
Agricultural implements, 1169-1175
Bananas, 1166
Exempted articles, 246, 1151
Fertilizers, 1151, 1159, 1162, 1395, 1400
Gravel and sand, 1160-1165
Newfoundland partridge berries, 1166

Taxation, War—*Con.*
Customs—*Con.*
Resolutions, 1168
Revenue, estimated, 1169
Silk, 1167
Spirits, 1152
Tea and coffee, 1168
Valuation, 605, 1152
Special
Bank circulation, 1191
Bills of exchange, cheques, etc., 1177-1205, 1407
Corporations, 1191-1197
Date of operation, 613
French treaty, articles under, 1211-1216
Department of Justice, opinion of, 1422
Insurance companies, 1178, 1191, 1405
Letters and post cards, 1206
Exempted postal matter, 1413
Loan and trust companies, 1191
Modifications, proposed, 1177
Money orders, etc., 1205
Penalties, 1411, 1418, 1427, 1586
Postal rates and stamp taxes, 1412-1421, 1586
Proprietary or patent medicines, 312, 1208, 1423
Resolutions, 1175
Revenue, estimated, 1208
Railway tickets, 1197-1201, 1406
Telegraphic messages, 1192, 1406
Vessel tickets, 1201
Wines, 1208-1216, 1422
See Budget, Customs Tariff War Revenue Bill, Special War Revenue Bill, *and* Ways and Means

Taylor, Mr. James D. (New Westminster)
Hansard, omissions from, 689
Vancouver Terminal Railway Company, 1262

Technical education, 245, 495, 502, 1146

Telegraphers. *See* Labour

Telephones, free, for Government officials, 1968

Temiscouata postal service, 392

Terminal elevators. *See* Grain Act

Thoburn, Mr. William (North Lanark)
Soldiers, votes for, 2270
War supplies and Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 1669

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Aviation school, Canadian, 1989
Silver-lead bounties, 1937
Trade with Russia and South America, 1935
Yukon, the, 1580-1584

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Bank loans for seed grain, 1352. *See* Western farmers
Budget, 811
Conditions in the west, 812
The new taxation, 813
Tariff increases, 814
Made-in-Canada campaign, 816
British preference, 816
Qu'Appelle postmasters, dismissal of, 436
Western farmers, relief for, 60, 1341, 1352

Three Rivers
Harbour, 2155, 2175
Public building, 1786

Timber protection, 233, 1560, 1566, 1578

Tobin, Mr. Edmund W. (Richmond-Wolfe)
Colcleugh, F. W. R., employment of, 1648
Cookshire post office, 1991
Horses, embargo on, 1235
Prices of feed and foodstuffs, 2080
St. Mathieu, dredging at, 2174
Richelieu river wharves, 995
Rimouski dredging, 897
Richmond county, Quebec, farmers, relief for, 1237
Vezina's Corners postmastership, 1991
War supplies—horses, 830, 1146

Tobique Indian reserve, 187

Toronto
Customs examining warehouse and postal station A, 2039
Harbour improvements, 1975
Home guard, 243
Post office building, 1970

Trade and Commerce
Commissioners and agents, 1930-1936
Department
Estimates, 212, 1291, 1931
Reports in French, 828
Staff and salaries, 212
China and Japan, 1931, 1932
Russia, 1931, 1935
South America, 1934, 1935
West Indies, 215, 1295

Trawling. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Tree culture, 233

Tremain, Mr. H. B. (Hants)
Budget, 824
Opposition criticisms, 824
Protection and revenue, 825
Interest of the farmers, 826
Party co-operation necessary, 827

Trent canal
Commission, 632
Construction, 1712

Truax, Mr. R. E. (South Bruce)
Chesley public building, 1646

Tufts Cove drydock, 1647

Turgeon, Mr. Onesiphore (Gloucester)
Bathurst harbour, 46
Budget, 700, 709
The war expenditures, 700
Financial conditions in Canada, 701
Taxation and British preference, 703, 712
Tariff and protection, 709
Economy of expenditure, 712
Encouragement of agriculture, 713
The war and a general election, 714
Controverted elections, 2024
Mizonnette lighthouse, 46
Parliamentary representation, 1465
Privilege—St. John Standard, 145
Soldiers, votes for, 2509

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)
Budget, 417
The war expenditures, 417
Ordinary expenditures, 418
The increased taxation, 420
The Civil Service, 423
Retrenchment and economy, 424
Farmers and the tariff, 426, 430
Taxation of British goods, 429
Canadian Northern Railway Company—extension of time, 759
Canadian Pacific Railway steamship services, 733, 754
Dominion elections
Hours of polling, 1911
Voters' lists, 1898
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., report of, 2572
Fisher, Captain E., employment of, 517
Food exports, government control of, 542
Freight rates, proposed increase of, 351
Grain trade, 1944, 1947
Hudson Bay railway—wages of employees, 1395
Inland navigation rates, 253
Inland Revenue, Deputy Minister of, 438
Intercolonial railway—payments to Messrs. Boulay, 2530
Longueuil dredging, 438
McQuarrie, Major, 2528
Maple sugar, adulteration of, 1793
Nickle, export of, 1937
Ottawa—buildings rented by Government, 148, 308
Privilege—Toronto Evening Telegram, 480
Railway capitalization, 288
Regina property purchase by Government, 2188
Soldiers, votes for, 2269, 2274, 2518

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)—*Con.*
War supplies
Automobile tires, 1145
Comforts for soldiers, 292
Field glasses, 155
Pails, 152
Razors, 307
Western farmers, relief for, 71

Tyrian, steamer, repairs to, 1786

Unemployment. *See* Labour

Union Life Assurance Company, 2317, 2372

Valcartier Camp
Accounts, payment of, 312
Fair-wage clause in government contracts, 240, 391
Land claims 522, 1546, 1739, 2621
Lighting, 2122
Lumber contracts, 2122
Selection, 1513
Stores, disposal of, 308
Supplies, destruction of, 149

Vallée, L. O., dismissal of, 436

Valley railway, operation of, 142

Vancouver
Harbour
Commission, 1875
Improvements, 1975
Terminal Railway Company, 990

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (Maisonneuve)
Belgian immigration, 632
Budget, 1081
The Government's taxation policy, 1081
Public works expenditures, 1083
The made-in-Canada movement, 1083
Taxation of coal and raw materials, 1084
Effects of high tariffs, 1085
War and democracy, 1088
Carslake Hotel Company, claims of, 2528
Contrecoeur public works, 1651
Dominion elections—hours of polling, 2498
Fair-wage clause in government contracts, 240, 391
First Canadian contingent, British-born in, 610
Food exports, government control of, 540
Laprairie government road, 2159
Montreal—dismissals of public works employees, 1652
Post office
Branch offices, 2296
Registered letters to members, 2296
Public works and industrial distress, 2040. *See* Budget
Railway employees, voting of, 2498, 2502
Soldiers, votes for, 2264, 2289, 2498, 2508

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (Maisonneauve)—*Con.*
Taxation—railway tickets, 1198
Telegraphers, conditions of employment of, 1786, 2532
Unemployment, 605. *See* Budget
Winnipeg immigration officials, 392

Vezina's Corners postmastership, 1991

Victoria Memorial Museum. *See* Ottawa

Voters' lists, preparation of, 1594

Votes for soldiers. *See* Soldiers' Voting Bill

Wade, W. W., dismissal of, 1395

Wallaceburg customs collector, 766

War
Canadian forces—statement of mobilization and organization, 2364
Censorship, 1264, 1448, 1496, 1506, 1618
Cerebro-spinal meningitis among soldiers, 2529
Chaplains, 242
Enlistment, 438, 1456, 2531
Civil servants, 233, 312, 522
Expenditures, 1142, 1397. *See* War Appropriation Bill *and* War supplies
First Canadian contingent, 610, 763
France, Canadian troops in, 204, 909
Home guard, 1516
Payment of soldiers, 2320
Pensions, 141, 1188, 1394, 1450
Princess Patricia regiment, transport of, 391
Railway engineering corps, 1525
Recruiting. *See* Enlistment
Seeley, Colonel, command of, 1284
Shooting by sentries, 332, 2124
Soldiers
Cerebro-spinal meningitis among, 2529
Life insurance, 390
Mail matter for, 338, 1419, 1422
Payment of, 2320
Votes for. *See* Soldiers' Voting Bill
Supplies
Agents, employment of, 40. *See* Allison
Allison J. Wesley, services of, 1145, 1452, 1508, 1669
Ammunition, 91, 242, 1451, 1506-1512, 1669, 1867
Automobile tires, 1145
Bicycles, 767, 995
Binoculars, 2188, 2372, 2602, 2605
Boots, 21, 48, 144, 149, 204, 244, 2372, 2450
British Government, for, 38, 2461, 2614
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, correspondence of, 1667, 2189, 2461
Canvas shoes, 389, 763
Carleton Drug Company, 2602, 2605, 2614

War—*Con.*

Supplies—*Con.*
Clinic thermometers, 307, 521
Committee of Council, 1246, 1666
Corruption, charge of, 1144
Fair wage clause in Government contracts, 240, 391
Field glasses, 155
Hay, 140, 241, 1289, 1397
Horses, 149, 246, 249, 314, 388, 520, 607, 631, 766, 829, 894, 898, 994, 1146, 1230-1235, 1455, 1867, 1993, 2095-2196, 2602, 2606, 2613
Housewives, 1650
Investigations
Boots: notice of m. for special Com., 144; ref. to Com., 204; rep. of Com., 2372
Public Accounts Com.: ref. to Com., 945; announcement, 2538; rep. of Com., 2602
Medical, 149, 308, 315, 1526, 1866
Motor trucks, 306, 1145, 1186, 1290
Oliver equipment, 1992
Overshoes, 315, 762
Pails, 152
Razors, 307
Remounts. *See* Horses
Ross rifle, 306, 439
Saddles, 521, 632
Salisbury camp, 306, 439
Seasickness cure, 152
Sheepskins, 1866
Shells, 38, 2614
Fair wages in manufacture of, 490
Shovel shields, 437, 1235
Slippers, 389
System of purchase, 2602, 2610, 2614, 2617
Waterproof garments, 609
See Militia
Taxation. *See that title*

War Appropriation ($100,000,000) Bill. Res., 91, 1397. 1r., 1399. 2r., 1653. Com., 1653. 3r., 1681

Warnock, Mr. David (Macleod)
Waterloo lakes park, 236
Western farmers, relief for, 65, 1333

Washington, Canadian representative at, 2315

Water-power investigations, 234

Ways and Means, Committee of, 87, 1150, 1168, 1191; rep., 1217. *See* Budget *and* Taxation

Webster, Mr. John (Brockville)
Technical education, 1146

Weichel, Mr. William G. (North Waterloo)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Tribute to Their Royal Highnesses, 4
Great Britain and the war, 5
Financial and trade conditions, 6
Made-in-Canada movement, 7
German-Canadians, 8
Unity of the Empire, 9
Deceased members, 10

Weights and measures, inspection of, 505, 510, 1720

Welland canal
Construction, 1710, 1713
Wages, rates of, 491

West Arichat customs, 898

West Indies, trade with, 215, 1295

Western Farmers Relief Bill. Res., 1328. 1r., 1349. 2r., 1544. Com., 1544. 3r., 1544. *See* 49, 632, 720, 768, 947, 1150, 1242, 1281; *also* Bank Act Amendment Bill

Wetaskawin settlers, grievances of, 1560, 1565

White, Mr. Gerald V. (North Renfrew)
Pembroke drill hall, 2039

White, Hon. W. T. (Minister of Finance)
Bank borrowings from Government, 147, 476
Bank loans for seed grain, 1242-1246, 1350 1358
Battlefields commission, 1716
Budget, 80
Revenue and expenditure, 81, 82
Organization of oversea forces, 81
Debt and borrowings, 82
Special taxes, 85
Tariff taxation, 86
Economic conditions, actual and prospective, 90
Budget—amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. 841
Reply to criticisms, 841
Expenditures of late Government, 841, 848, 853
National Transcontinental railway, 841
Public works, 845
World-wide effects of war, 846
British preference, 849, 860
Public works and labour, 850
Proposed war taxation, 851, 854
Opposition alternatives, 855
Tax on railway tickets, 857
Postage, 857
Customs taxes, 858
Industrial and agricultural interests, 858
Taxation of banks, 859
Canada's share in war, 862

White, Hon. W. T. (Minister of Finance)—*Con.*
Casualty Company of Canada, 761
Finance—charges of management, 1715
Dominion notes, issue of, 146, 479, 1528, 1653
French treaty and war taxes, 1211, 1422
Loans, Imperial Government, to Canada, 146
Shortt, Mr. Adam, speech of, 655, 682
Taxation, war
Customs
Agricultural implements, 1169, 1173
Bananas, 1166
Exemptions, 1151
Fertilizers, 1151, 1160, 1401
Gravel and sand, 1165
Newfoundland partridge berries, 1166
Revenue estimated, 1169
Silk, 1167
Spirits, 1152
Tea and coffee, 1168
Special
Bank circulation, 1191
Bills of exchange, cheques, etc., 1177, 1202-1204, 1407
Corporations, 1191-1197
French treaty, articles under, 1211-1216, 1422
Insurance companies, 1178, 1181, 1191
Letters and postcards, 1206
Exempted postal matter, 1413
Loan and trust companies, 1191, 1405
Modifications, proposed, 1177
Money orders, etc., 1205
Penalties, 1412, 1427, 1586-1588
Postal rates and stamp taxes, 1412-1422, 1586, 2624
Proprietary or patent medicines, 1209, 1423
Railway tickets, 1198-1201
Revenue estimated, 1208
Telegraphic messages, 1192, 1406
Vessel tickets, 1201
Wines, 1211-1216, 1422
See Budget
Union Life Assurance Company, 2317, 2372

Wilcox, Mr. Oliver J. (North Essex)
Budget, 630, 689
Tax on fertilizers, 630, 695
Party truce, 689
Revenue and expenditure, 692
Obligations of Government, 693

Wilcox, Mr. Oliver J. (North Essex)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Hog cholera, 696
Political patronage, 696
What Government has accomplished, 697
Naval question, 698
Vital issues of the war, 699
Taxation
Fertilizers, 1162
Gravel, 1161, 1165

Wilson, Mr. Charles A. (Laval)
Capital punishment, 1228
Lavergne, Armand, Lieut.-Col., 1517
Real estate, titles to, 1222
Roy, Alex., Col., retirement of, 1516

Winding-Up Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2121. 2r., 2195. Com., 2195. 3r., 2195.

Winnipeg
Immigration officials, 243, 392
Public buildings, 2041
Resident engineer, 765
Sewage, 2167
Volunteers, 313

Wireless stations, 1263, 1616, 1658

Wood, E. C., land patent of, 151

Woodworth, T. C., employment of, 2123

Wrecks. *See* Marine

Wrentham post office, 142

Wright, Mr. William (Muskoka)
Budget, 431, 442
Tariff policy, 431
Protection in Canada, 433
British preference, 434
Farming conditions in the west, 443
Trade and industry, 447
A non-partisan tariff board, 448
Experimental farms, 2072
Grain trade, 1952, 2192
Parcel post, 1385

Yarmouth
Fishery guardians, 313
Harbour improvements, 607, 1289, 2113
Marine hospital, 832
Postal service, 313, 1361

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 514. 2r., 1218. Com. and 3r., 1218. Sen. amdt., 1868

Yukon territory, 1393, 1580